

THE  
Bishop of *Worcester's*  
ANSWER  
TO  
Mr. *Locke's* Second Letter;  
Wherein his NOTION of  
IDEAS  
Is prov'd to be Inconsistent with it self,  
And with the  
ARTICLES  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN FAITH.

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed by J. H. for Henry Mortlock  
at the *Phoenix* in St. Paul's Church-  
Yard, MDCXCVIII.

Stillington, Edward, Bishop of Worcester.

5



---

THE  
Bishop of *Worcester's*  
ANSWER  
TO

Mr. *Locke's* Second Letter, &c.

S I R,

I Was not a little surpriz'd at the length of your *Second Letter*, considering the shortness of the Answer contained in it: But it put me in mind of the Springs of *Modena* mention'd by *Ramazzini*, which rise up with such a plenty of Water upon opening a Passage, that the Undertaker is afraid of being overwhelm'd by it. I see how dangerous it is to give occasion to a Person of such a fruitfull Invention to write; for *Letters* become *Books*, and small Books will soon rise to great Volumes,

A 2 if

if no way be found to give a Check to such an *Ebullition* of Thoughts, as some Men find within themselves. I was apt to think the best way were, to let Nature spend it self; and although those who *write out of their own Thoughts* do it with as much Ease and Pleasure as a Spider spins his Web; yet the World soon grows weary of Controversies, especially when they are about Personal Matters: Which made me wonder that one who understands the World so well, should spend above fifty *Pages of a Letter* in renewing and enlarging a *Complaint* wholly concerning himself. Suppose I had *born* a little too hard upon you in joyning your Words and *another's Intentions* together; had it not been an easie and effectual way of clearing your self, to have declared to the World, that you owned the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, as it hath been Received in the Christian Church, and is by ours in the *Creeds and Articles of Religion*? This had stopt the Mouths of the Clamorous, and had removed the Suspicions of the Doubtfull, and would have given full Satisfaction to all reasonable Men. But when you so carefully avoid doing this, all other Arts and Evasions do but leave the Matter more suspicious among the  
most

most Intelligent and Impartial Readers. This I mention, not that you need be afraid of *the Inquisition*, or that I intend to charge you with Heresie in denying *the Trinity*; but my present Design is to shew, That your Mind is so intangled and set fast by your *Notion of Ideas*, that you know not what to make of the Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*; because you can have no *Idea* of *One Nature* and *three Persons*, nor of *two Natures* and *one Person*; as will fully appear afterwards. And therefore, out of regard to Publick Service, in order to the preventing a growing Mischief, I shall endeavour to lay open the ill Consequences of your Way of *Ideas* with respect to the *Articles of the Christian Faith*.

But I shall wave all unnecessary *Repetitions*, and come immediately to the Matter of your Complaint as it is renewed in this *Second Letter*, which I shall briefly answer, before I proceed to that which I chiefly design. Your Complaint, you say, was, *That you were* <sup>2d. Letter,</sup> *brought into a Controversie wherein you* <sup>p. 2.</sup> *had never meddled, nor knew how you came to be concerned in.* I told you, "It was because the Person who opposed the

Ans. to  
first Letter,  
p. 46.

“ Mysteries of Christianity went upon  
“ your Grounds, and made use of your  
“ Words; although I declared withall,  
“ that they were used to other purposes  
“ than you intended them; and I con-  
“ fess’d, that the reason why I quoted  
“ your Words so much, was, because I  
“ found your Notion as to Certainty by  
“ Ideas, was the main Foundation on  
“ which the Author of *Christianity not*  
“ *Mysterious* went; and that he had no-  
“ thing that look’d like Reason, if that  
“ Principle were removed; which made  
“ me so much endeavour to shew, that  
“ it would not hold, and so I supposed  
“ the reason why I so often mention’d  
“ your Words, was no longer a Riddle  
“ to you. These Passages you set down  
2d. Letter, in your *Second Letter*; but you say, *all*  
2. 48. *this seems to you to do nothing towards the*  
p. 49. *clearing of this matter.* Whether it doth  
or not, I am content to leave it to any  
indifferent Reader; and there it must  
rest at last, although you should write  
*Volumes* about it.

p. 50.

But for what cause do you continue so  
unsatisfied? You tell us, *It is, that the*  
*Author mentioned, went upon this Ground,*  
*That clear and distinct Ideas are necessary*  
*to Certainty, but that is not your Notion*  
as

*as to Certainty by Ideas ; which is, That Certainty consists in the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of Ideas, such as we have, whether they be in all their Parts perfectly clear and distinct or no : And you say, that you have no Notions of Certainty more than this one.*

This is no more than what you had *First Letter* said before in your former Letter, and I *ter, p. 57.* took particular notice of it, and gave three several Answers to it, which I shall here lay together and defend, because you seem to think I had not answered it.

(1.) “ That those who offer at clear  
 “ and distinct Ideas bid much fairer  
 “ for Certainty than you do (accor-  
 “ ding to this Answer) and speak more  
 “ agreeably to your Original Grounds  
 “ of Certainty. For it is a very wonder-  
 full thing in point of Reason, for you  
 to pretend to *Certainty by Ideas*, and  
 not allow those *Ideas* to be *clear and dis-*  
*distinct* ? You say, *the Certainty lies in the*  
*Perception of the Agreement or Disagree-*  
*ment of Ideas* : How can I clearly per-  
 ceive the *Agreement or Disagreement of*  
*Ideas*, if I have not *clear and distinct I-*  
*deas* ? For how is it possible for a Man’s  
 Mind to know whether they *agree or dis-*

p. 80.

agree, if there be some *parts of those Ideas*, we have only general and confused *Ideas* of ? And therefore I had great reason to say, that if Certainty be placed in Ideas we must have clear and distinct Ideas. You may as well say, a Man may be certain of the *Agreement* and *Disagreement* of Colours in a confused or uncertain Light. For so much as the Idea fails of Clearness and Distinctness, so much it fails of that *Evidence* which it is necessary to judge by. Where-ever there is *Obscurity*, *Confusion* or *Imperfection in the Ideas*, there must be so much Uncertainty in the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of them. And to pretend to Certainty by Ideas without pretending to clear and distinct Ideas, is to judge without Evidence, and to determine a thing to be certainly true, when we cannot know whether it be so or not; for how can you be sure *that your Ideas agree with the Reality of things* (wherein you place the *Certainty of Knowledge*) if there be no such Ideas of those things, that you can perceive their true Nature, and their difference from all others ? For therein you will not deny that the Notion of *clear and distinct Ideas consists*.

But

But you say more than once or twice, *Letter II.*  
 or ten times, *That I blame those who* 2, 9, 10.  
*place Certainty in clear and distinct Ideas,* 12, 14, 15,  
*but you do it not, and yet I bring you in* 16, 23, 38,  
*among them ;* which is the thing you so 39, 41, 47,  
 much complain of. I will give you a 50, 56, 61,  
 full Answer to this *Complaint.* I do not 107, 114.  
 deny, but the first occasion of my  
 Charge was the Supposition *that clear*  
*and distinct Ideas were necessary in order*  
*to any Certainty in our Minds, and that*  
*the only way to attain this Certainty was*  
*by comparing these Ideas together :* But to  
 prove this, your Words were produced,  
 and your Principles of Certainty laid  
 down, and none else; and I could not  
 imagine that you could place Certainty  
 in the Agreement or Disagreement of I-  
 deas, and yet not suppose those Ideas to  
 be clear and distinct. But finding your  
 self joyned in such Company which you  
 did not desire to be seen in, you rather  
 chose to distinguish your self from them,  
 by denying clear and distinct Ideas to be  
 necessary to Certainty. But it must be  
 here observed, that our Debate about  
*Certainty by Ideas* is not about any other  
 Certainty, but about *Certainty of Know-*  
*ledge* with regard to some *Proposition,*  
 whose Ideas are to be compared as to  
 their

their Agreement and Disagreement. For  
 Essay, B. 4. your Words are, *Certainty of Knowledge*  
 ch. 6. Sect. *is to perceive the Agreement or Disagree-*  
 3. *ment of Ideas as expressed in any Proposi-*  
 First Let- *tion. This we usually call knowing or be-*  
 ter, p. 57. *ing certain of the truth of any Proposition.*  
 So that a *Proposition* whose Ideas are to  
 be compared as to their Agreement or Dis-  
 agreement, is the proper Object of this  
 Certainty. And therefore *this Certainty*  
 is to be distinguished,

I. From a *Certainty by Sense*; or that  
 by which we come to know the Existence  
 of External Objects. For you say, *That*  
 B. 4. ch. *the Knowledge of the Existence of any*  
 11. Sect. 1. *other thing we can have only by Sensation.*  
*For there being no necessary Connexion of*  
*Real Existence with any Idea a Man hath*  
*in his Memory; no particular Man can*  
*know the Existence of any other Being,*  
*but only when by actual operating upon him*  
*it makes it self perceived by him. But*  
*that this is quite another Certainty from*  
*that of Ideas, appears from these follow-*  
*ing words of yours; For the having the*  
*Idea of any thing in our Mind, no more*  
*proves the Existence of that thing than the*  
*Picture of a Man evidences his being in the*  
*World, or the Visions of a Dream make*  
*thereby a true History. Therefore this is*  
 a very



a very different Certainty from that of *Ideas*.

2. From a *Certainty by Reason*; When from the Existence of some things evident to Sense, we infer the Existence of another thing not evident to Sense: As to take your own words in your former Letter. *As to the Existence of bodily* <sup>Letter</sup> *Substances, I know by my Senses, that* <sup>P. 57.</sup> *something extended, solid and figur'd does exist; for my Senses are the utmost Evidence and Certainty I have of the Existence of extended, solid, figured things. These Modes being then known to exist by our Senses, the Existence of them ( which I cannot conceive can subsist without something to support them ) makes me see the Connection of those Ideas with a Support, or as it is called, Subject of Inhesion, and so consequently the Connection of that Support, which cannot be nothing, with Existence.*

Granting all this, yet it by no means proves that we can have a *Certainty in the way of Ideas*, where the *Ideas* themselves by which we have the Certainty are *obscure and confused*; but that supposing the *Ideas* we have by our Senses to be *true*, we may from them infer the Existence of something of which we have only an *obscure and confused Idea*; which

which is the Case of *bodily Substances*. Of which I grant you may come to a certain Knowledge, but not a *Certainty by Ideas*, but by a Consequence of Reason deduced from the *Ideas* we have by our Senses. And this can never prove that we may have a *Certainty by Ideas*, where the *Ideas* themselves are not clear and distinct: For there is a great difference between having a *Certainty by reason*, of a thing whose *Idea is confused and obscure*, and having that *Certainty by obscure and confused Ideas*. For in this Case the *Idea of Substance is obscure*: but the way of *Certainty* is by a *clear Deduction of Reason from the Ideas we have by our Senses*.

3. From a *Certainty by Remembrance*; By which I mean the remaining Impression on the Mind of an Original *Certainty by Demonstration*. As to use  
 B.4. ch. 2. your own Instance; *A Man hath found*  
 Sect. 15. *by Mathematical Evidence, that the three*  
*Angles of a Triangle are equal to two Right*  
*Angles*; The Perception of this at the  
 time of the *Demonstration* was clear and  
 distinct; but afterwards, the Method of  
*Demonstration* may have slipt out of his  
 Mind, yet he retains a *Certainty* of the  
 thing by virtue of that *Demonstration*;  
 but

but this is not a *clear Perception*, as you would have it, *where the Ideas are confused*; but it is an obscure Remembrance of the grounds of that Certainty which he once had; and hath never seen any Reason since, why he should call it in Question.

These things then being put out of the Question, which belong not to it; the Question truly stated is, whether we can attain to any Certainty of Knowledge as to the Truth of a *Proposition* in the way of Ideas, where the Ideas themselves by which we come to that Certainty be not clear and distinct?

Another thing to be observed is, that *Des Cartes* who first started this way of Certainty by Ideas, thought it a ridiculous thing in any to pretend to it, unless their Ideas were clear and distinct. He saith, *That when we assent without clear Perception, we are either deceived, or fall into Truth by chance, but we do often err when we think we have clear Perception, and have not. But to a certain Judgment, it is necessary that our Perception be not only clear but distinct: that is, when the thing not only lies open to our view, but we see it on all sides, and so can distinguish it from all other things.*

*Princip.  
l. 1. n. 44,  
&c.*

You

You agree with him in placing Certainty in Ideas, but you differ from him in that which alone made his Opinion reasonable, *viz. That these Ideas be clear and distinct.* If it were possible for us to come to clear and distinct Ideas of the things we pretend to be certain of, it were a just Pretence to Certainty in that way ; but since we cannot come at them, we must be content with such Measures of Knowledge as we are capable of. But for you to talk so much of *Certainty by Ideas*, and yet to allow *Obscurity* and *Imperfection* in those *Ideas*, is like a purblind Man who would pretend to judge exactly of the differences of Colours in the Twilight, because another pretended to do it at Noon-day : Or like one, who would undertake to shew certainly the *Agreement or Disagreement* of two Men at a distance from him, in their Habit, Features, and Stature, and yet at the same time confess that he could not clearly distinguish one from the other. So that if I did think you spake more consistently to your *Hypothesis*, than you say now that you did, I hope you will forgive me that Wrong, if at least it be a *Wrong* to you ; for after all, there are several Passages in your *Essay*, which  
sup-

suppose *clear Ideas* necessary to *Certainty*.

For in one Place you say, *That the mind not being certain of the Truth of that it doth not evidently know.* What is this but to make *clear Ideas* necessary to *Certainty* ? B. 4. ch. 18. Sect. 8.

In another, yet more plainly, *That which is requisite to make our Knowledge certain is the Clearness of our Ideas.* B. 4. ch. 4. Sect. 8.

In a third Place you say ; *For it being evident that our Knowledge cannot exceed our Ideas ; where They are either imperfect, confused or obscure, we cannot expect to have certain, perfect or clear Knowledge.* B. 4. ch. 12. Sect. 14.

In a fourth ; *But obscure and confused Ideas can never produce any clear and certain Knowledge, because as far as any Ideas are confused or obscure, the mind can never perceive clearly whether they agree or disagree.* What can be more express ? B. 4. ch. 2. Sect. 15.  
And yet you have complained of me in near twenty Places of your *second Letter* for charging this upon you. By this the World will judge of the Justice of your Complaints, and the *Consistency* of your Notion of *Ideas*.

(2.) I answer'd, " That it is very possible the Authour of *Christianity* not  
" *myste-* Answ. to Let 1 p. 36.

“ *mysterious*, might mistake or misapply  
 “ your Notions, but there is too much  
 “ reason to believe he thought them the  
 “ same, and we have no reason to be  
 “ sorry that he hath given you this oc-  
 “ casion for the explaining your mean-  
 “ ing, and for the Vindication of your  
 “ self in the matters you apprehend he  
 “ had charged you with.

Let. 2 p. 36. Here you enter upon a fresh Com-  
 plaint, and say, *This can be no Reason*  
*why you should be joyned with a Man that*  
*had misapplied your Notions ; and that no*  
*Man hath so much mistaken and misappli-*  
*ed your Notions as my self, and therefore*  
*you ought rather to be joyned with me.* But  
 is this fair and ingenuous dealing, to  
 represent this matter so, as if I had join-  
 ed you together, *because he had misunder-*  
*stood and misapplied your Notions ?* Can  
 you think me a Man of so little Sense  
 to make that the Reason of it ? No, Sir,  
 it was because he assigned no other  
 Grounds but yours, and that in *your*  
*own Words*, however now you would di-  
 vert the meaning of them another way.  
 And although I was willing to allow  
 you all reasonable Occasions for your  
 own *Vindication*, as appears by my Words ;  
 yet I was sensible enough, that you had  
 given

given too just an Occasion to apply them in that manner, as appears by the next Page. But because these words follow some I had quoted out of your *Postscript*, you fall into a nice Piece of *Criticism* about them, which, you say, in *Grammatical Construction*, must refer to the Words of the *Postscript*; but any one that reads without a design to cavil, would easily interpret them of your *Words* and *Notions* about which the Debate was; and not of the *Postscript* which comes in but as a *Parentthesis*. This looks like *Chicaning* in Controversie; which no Man; who knows his Cause is good, ever falls into.

But if, you say, by an unintelligible new Way of Construction the word *Them* be applied to any Passages in your Book: What then? Why then, whoever they are, you intend to complain of them too. But the Words just before tell you who they are, viz. *The Enemies of the Christian Faith*. And is this all that you intend, only to complain of them for making you a Party in the Controversie against the Trinity? But whether you have not made your self too much a Party in it, will appear, before we have done.

I had with great Kindness, as I thought, taken notice of a Passage in your *Post-script*: in which I was glad to find that in general, you owned *the Mysteries of the Christian Faith, and the Scripture to be the Foundation and Rule of it*: From whence I inferr'd, that I could not believe you intended to give any Advantage to the Enemies of the Christian Faith. *This Passage, you say, you were surprized to find in a Paragraph design'd to give you satisfaction.* There are some Persons I find very hard to be *satisfied*. For I speak of my *satisfaction* in this Passage, and that I was glad you agreed so far with me, although you could not come up in all things to what I could wish. But what Reason have you to express so much dissatisfaction at these Words? You call it *an extraordinary sort of Complement*; and that they *seem to intimate as though I took you for a Heathen before.*

How like a cavilling Exception is this? Do not we know that in the Debate about *the Mysteries of Faith* our Adversaries are no *Heathens*; but they deny any *Mysteries*: I was glad to find that you owned them; and resolved your Faith into the Scripture as the Foundation



tion of it. Did not this look more like a good Opinion of you as to these matters, than any Inclination to suspect you for a *Heathen*?

But you say, *It must not be taken for granted, that those who do not write or appear in Print in Controversies of Religion do not own the Christian Faith, and the Scriptures as the Rule of it.* I was far enough from any such Apprehension; but the Case is quite otherwise, with those who are not sparing of writing about *Articles of Faith*, and among them take great Care to avoid some which have been always esteem'd fundamental Articles by the Christian Church. And I think it was no want of *Humanity* or *Christian Charity* in me, that I was so glad to find you own the *Mysteries of the Christian Faith* in general: which shews at least, that you cannot object against any *Articles of Faith*, because they contain something *mysterious* in them.

But I said, *That in all things your Answer doth not come fully up to what I could wish.* And I think I gave sufficient Proof of it, as to your *Idea of Substance, the Nature of Ideas, the Materiality of the Soul, the disparaging some Arguments to prove the Existence of God, the Tendency*

of your Principles; and the Ground of Certainty, &c. Which are put off to another Letter, except the last, which is therefore now to be examin'd.

Answer to  
Letter 1.  
p. 38.

(3.) The third Answer I gave was,  
“ That your own Grounds of Certainty,  
“ tend to Scepticism; and that in an Age  
“ wherein the Mysteries of Faith are too  
“ much exposed by the Promoters of  
“ Scepticism and Infidelity, it is a thing  
“ of dangerous Consequence to start such  
“ new Methods of Certainty, as are apt  
“ to leave Men's minds more doubtful  
“ than before. *These words, you say, contain a farther Accusation of your Book, which shall be consider'd in its due Place.*  
But this is the proper Place of considering it. For I said, “ That hereby you  
“ have given too just occasion to the Enemies of the Christian Faith, to make  
“ use of your Words and Notions, as was  
“ evidently proved from your own Confessions. And if this be so, however  
I was willing to have had you explained your self to the general Satisfaction; yet since you decline it; I do insist upon it, that you cannot clear your self from laying that Foundation, which the Author of *Christianity not mysterious* built upon. For your Ground of Certainty is

Letter 2.  
p. 46.

the

*the Agreement or Disagreement of the Ideas, as expressed in any Proposition.* Which are your own Words. From hence I urged, "That let the Proposition come  
 "to us any way, either by Humane or  
 "Divine Authority, if our Certainty depend upon this, we can be no more  
 "certain, than we have clear Perception  
 "of the Agreement or Disagreement of  
 "Ideas contained in it. And from hence  
 "the Author of *Christianity not mysterious* thought he had Reason to reject  
 "all Mysteries of Faith which are contained in Propositions, upon your  
 "Grounds of Certainty. By this it evidently appears, that although I was willing to allow you all fair ways of interpreting your own Sense; yet I by no means thought that your Words were wholly *misunderstood* or *misapplied* by that Author: but rather that he saw into the true Consequence of them, as they lie in your Book. And what Answer do you give to this? Not a word in the proper Place for it. But afterwards (for I would omit nothing that may seem to help your Cause) you offer something towards an Answer. For there you distinguish *the Certainty of* Letter 12.  
*Faith, and the Certainty of Knowledge,* p. 95

and you humbly conceive the Certainty of Faith, if I think fit to call it so, hath nothing to do with the Certainty of Knowledge; and to talk of the Certainty of Faith seems all one to you as to talk of the Knowledge of Believing, a way of speaking not easie for you to understand. So that if I shake never so much the Certainty of Knowledge, it doth not at all concern the Assurance of Faith, that is quite distinct from it, neither stands nor falls with Knowledge. Faith stands by it self and upon Grounds of its own, nor can be removed from them and placed on those of Knowledge. Their Grounds are so far from being the same, or having any thing, that when it is brought to Certainty, Faith is destroyed, 'tis Knowledge then and Faith no longer. So that, whether you are, or are not mistaken in the placing Certainty in the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of Ideas, Faith still stands upon its own Basis, which is not at all alter'd by it; and every Article of that hath just the same unmoved Foundation, and the very same Credibility that it had before. This is the Substance of what you say about this Matter, and is the most considerable Passage in your Book towards clearing this Matter.

But

But I was aware of this, as appears by these Words ; “ Is Faith an unreasonable Act ? Is it not an Assent to a Proposition ? Then, if all Certainty in Acts of Reason be derived from the perceiving the Agreement or Disagreement of the Ideas contained in it ; either there can be no Certainty in the reasonable Act of Faith, or the Grounds of Certainty must be laid some other Way.

*Answer to  
Letter 1.  
p 83.*

But this is a Matter of too great Weight and Consequence to be easily past over, because the main strength of your Defence lies in it, and therefore I shall more strictly examine what you say ; and set this Point of *the Certainty of Faith* in as good a Light as I can, and shew the Inconsistency of your Notion of Ideas, with the Articles of the Christian Faith. *To talk of the Certainty of Faith, say you, seems all one to you as to talk of the Knowledge of Believing ; a way of speaking not easie for you to understand.*

But how comes *the Certainty of Faith* to become so hard a Point with you ? Have not all Mankind, who have talked of Matters of Faith, allow'd a *Certainty of Faith* as well as a *Certainty of Knowledge*, although upon different Grounds ? In your former Letter you told us, *that*

*if we knew the Original of Words, we should be much helped to the Ideas they were first applied to and made to stand for. Now what is there in the Original of the word Certainty which makes it incapable of being applied to Faith? I had thought that our Word was taken from the Latin; and that among the Romans it was opposed to doubting, Nil tam certum quam quod de dubio certum.*

And therefore where the Mind upon examination of the Grounds of Assent saw no Reason for doubting, it might properly be said to be *certain*: If it sees no Cause to doubt from the Evidence of the Thing it self, or the clear Deduction of Consequences, that is *Certainty of Knowledge*; but where it sees no Reason to doubt from the Authority of him that speaks, that is *Certainty of Believing*; and the greater the Authority of him that speaks, the less Reason there is to doubt, and therefore the greater Certainty of Faith. And this I think is *very easie to be understood*, and so have the Generality of Mankind thought to this Day. But it seems our old Words must not now pass in the current Sense; but then it is fit they be *called in*, and *new stampt*, that we may have none but *New milled Words*

to talk with; but in common Justice, a competent Time ought to be allow'd for it, that none be surprized; and in the mean time they ought to pass in their current Sense; and that is all the Favour I desire in this Matter. But I am utterly against any *Private Mints of Words*; and think those Persons assume too much Authority to themselves, who will not suffer common Words to pass in their general Acceptation; but will set such Bounds and Limits to the Sense of them, as suit best with their own Speculations.

*But is not this all one as to talk of the Knowledge of Believing?* For what Reason? *Knowledge* and *Faith* are too distinct things, the one relates to *Evidence*, and the other to *Testimony*; but Certainty is common to them both, unless you think it impossible to be certain upon any Testimony whatsoever. You tell us in your *Postscript* (which I hope may be brought hither without Offence) *that* *Postscript*  
p. 3. *it is a shame among Christians to raise such a Doubt of this, Whether an infinitely powerfull and wise Being be veracious or no.* Then I suppose the Veracity of God is a certain and undoubted Principle; and if there be sufficient Means to assure

sure us of Divine Revelation ( as I doubt not but you yield there are ) what should hinder one, that believes upon such Grounds as are sufficient to convince him, from attaining to a *Certainty of Faith* ? But you take *Certainty* as belonging only to *Knowledge*. So do the *Papists*, as belonging only to *Infallibility*, and say there can be no *Certainty of Faith*, where there is not an *Infallible Proponent* ; but neither you nor they are to impose upon the Understandings of Mankind, who know how to distinguish the *Grounds of Certainty* both from *Knowledge* and *Infallibility*. You allow such a thing as *Assurance of Faith* ; and why not *Certainty* as well as *Assurance* ? I know no reason, but that you have appropriated *Certainty* to the *Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of Ideas in any Proposition* ; and now you find this will not hold as to *Articles of Faith* ; and therefore you will allow no *Certainty of Faith* ; which I think is not for the Advantage of your Cause.

P. 96.

But you go on and tell us, *That if this Way of Certainty by Ideas doth not hold, yet it cannot affect Matters of Faith which stand immoveable upon other Grounds ; Faith in your own words stands still upon*  
its



*its own Basis ; and every Article of it has just the same unmoved Foundation, and the very same Credibility that it had before.* This will appear to be an extraordinary Answer, when we have thoroughly examin'd it. Here we see Faith is taken not with respect to the *general Grounds of Certainty*, but to the *particular Articles of Faith*, i. e. the *Propositions* contained in that Revelation which we embrace on the Account of its Divine Authority; now these *Propositions* are of several Kinds.

1. Some that are more clearly expressed therein, but such as might be attained to by the Light of Reason without Revelation. And such are the fundamental Principles of natural Religion, viz. The Being of God and Providence, and the Rewards and Punishments of a future State. These Mankind may attain to a *Certainty* in, without Revelation, or else there can be no such thing as natural Religion in the World; but these things are more fully and plainly revealed in the Scriptures. Let us now suppose a Person by natural Reason to attain to a *Certainty*, *as to the Being of God and Immortality of the Soul*; and he proceeds upon your general Grounds of

Cer-

Certainty, from the Agreement or Disagreement of Ideas ; and so from the Ideas of God and the Soul, he is made certain of those two Points before mention'd. But let us again suppose that such a Person upon a farther Examination of your Method of Proceeding finds, that the Way of Ideas in these Cases will not do ;

P. 131. for no Idea proves the Existence of the thing without it self, no more than the Picture of a Man proves his Being, or the Visions of a Dream make a true History, ( which are your own Expressions. ) And for the Soul he cannot be certain, but that Matter may think, ( as you affirm ) and then what becomes of the Soul's Immateriality ( and consequently Immortality ) from its Operations ? But for all this, say you, his Assurance of Faith remains firm on its own Basis. Now I appeal to any Man of Sense, whether the finding the Uncertainty of his own Principles which he went upon in Point of Reason, doth not weaken the Credibility of these fundamental Articles when they are consider'd purely as Matters of Faith ? For before, there was a natural Credibility in them on the Account of Reason ; but by going on wrong Grounds of Certainty, all that is lost ; and instead of

of being certain he is more doubtfull than ever. And if the Evidence of Faith falls so much short of that of Reason, it must needs have less Effect upon Mens Minds, when the subserviency of Reason is taken away; as it must be when the Grounds of Certainty by Reason are vanished. Is it at all probable, that he who finds his Reason deceive him in such Fundamental Points should have *his Faith stand firm and unmoveable* on the account of Revelation? For in Matters of Revelation, there must be some Antecedent Principles supposed before we can believe any thing on the Account of it.

And the first is, *that there is a God*; but this was the very thing he found himself at a loss in by his way of *Certainty by Ideas*; and how can his Faith stand firm as to Divine Revelation, when he is made Uncertain by his own Way, whether there be a God or no? Besides, to suppose Divine Revelation, we must be certain that there is a Principle above Matter and Motion in the World; but here we find, that upon the Principles of *Certainty by Ideas* he cannot be certain of this; because he doth not know but Matter may think; and consequently, all Revelation may be nothing but the Effects

Effects of an Exalted Fancy, or the Heats of a disordered Imagination, as *Spinoza* affirmed. Again, before there can be any such thing as *Assurance of Faith upon Divine Revelation*, there must be a Certainty as to *Sense and Tradition*; for there can be no Revelation pretended now without immediate Inspiration; and the Basis of our Faith is a Revelation contained in an Ancient Book, whereof the Parts were delivered at distant Times, but conveyed down to us by an Universal Tradition. But now, what if your Grounds of Certainty can give us no Assurance as to these things? I do not mean, that they cannot demonstrate Matters of Fact, which it were most unreasonable to expect; but that these Grounds of Certainty make all things uncertain; for I think I have proved, that this way of Ideas cannot give a satisfactory Account as to the Existence of the plainest Objects of Sense; because Reason cannot perceive the Connexion between the Objects and the Ideas. How then can we arrive to any Certainty in perceiving those Objects by their Ideas? And I was in the right, when I said *this Way tended to Scepticism*; and I do not think that consistent with the Assurance of Faith.

But

But this is an Imputation you take very ill, and say, that I have brought no Argument for it, but only that my great Prejudice against this Way of Certainty is, that it leads to Scepticism. (Scepticism is the New Mill'd Word.) This is very strange, when that Expression is only the Introduction to the Arguments from p. 125 to 132, to which no Answer at all is given. And so I leave it. Lett. II. P. 170.

There are other Propositions or Articles of Faith which wholly depend on the Sense of Words contained in the Scripture, and we are to enquire, whether the Assurance of Faith, as you call it, be consistent with the overthrowing your Grounds of Certainty; i. e. whether those who embrace the Articles of Faith in the Way of Ideas, can retain their Certainty of those Articles when these Ideas are quitted. And this alone will be a plain Demonstration in the Case, that the Certainty of Faith cannot stand with such Men, if this way of Certainty by Ideas be destroyed. And by this which I am now to make out, let any one judge how true your Words are like to prove, when you say, *Let the Grounds of Knowledge or Certainty be resolved into what they please, it touches not your Faith;*  
the

the Foundation of that stands as sure as before, and cannot be at all shaken by it. Of this we shall judge by some important Articles of Christian Faith according to your Ideas.

The first shall be that of the Resurrection of the Dead. The Reason of believing the Resurrection of the same Body upon your Grounds is from the Idea of Identity; which I take to be this from your own words. 1. That the Identity of living Creatures depends not on a Mass of the same Particles, but on something else; for in them the variation of great Parcels of Matter alters not the Identity; for which you instance in the growth of an Oak and a Horse. 2. That the Identity of a Man consists in nothing but a Participation of the same continued Life by constantly fleeting Particles of Matter, in Succession vitally united to the same Organized Body. 3. That Personal Identity, i. e. the sameness of a Rational Being lies in Self-consciousness, and in that alone, whether it be annexed only to one Individual Substance, or can be continued in a Succession of several Substances. 4. That those who place Thought in a purely material, animal Constitution, void of Spirit, do place Personal Identity in something else than Identity.

Essay, B. 2.  
ch. 27. n. 3.

n. 6.

n. 9.

n. 11.

*ity of Substance, as Animal Identity is preserved in Identity of Life and not of Substance.* 5. *That it matters not to this point of being the same self, whether this present self be made up of the same or other Substances.* 6. *That in this Personal Identity of Self-consciousness is founded all the Right and Justice of Reward and Punishment, Happiness and Misery, being that for which every one is concerned for himself, not mattering what becomes of any Substance not joined to, or affected with that Consciousness.* 7. *That the Sentence at the Day of Judgment will be justified by the Consciousness all Persons shall have that they themselves in what Bodies soever they appear, or what Substances soever that Consciousness adheres to, are the same that committed those Actions and deserve that Punishment for them.* This I suppose to be a true and just Account of your Sense of this Matter; and so the Article of the *Resurrection* is Resolved into your *Idea of Personal Identity*. And the Question between us now is, Whether your Certainty of this Matter from your *Idea* have no influence on the Belief of this Article of Faith? For the main of your Defence lies upon this Point, Whether your *Method of Certainty*

n. 16.  
 n. 18.  
 n. 16.

E by

Letter 2.  
p. 96.

*by Ideas, doth at all shake, or in the least concern the Assurance of Faith? which you absolutely deny, and affirm, That Faith stands upon its own Basis, and is not at all altered by your Method of Certainty; and every Article of that has just the same unmoved Foundation, and the very same Credibility that it had before. Now I take this Article of the Resurrection of the Dead to be an Article of Faith, and we are to consider, whether if your Method of Certainty by Ideas do hold in this Matter, it continues as firm, and in the same Credibility it had before? I shall not urge you with the Sense of our own or other Christian Churches in this Point of the Sameness of the Body in the Resurrection of the Dead, But I shall confine my self to the Scripture as the Foundation and Rule of our Faith; and the main Point is, Whether according to that, it be not necessary for the same Substance which was united to the Body to be raised up at the last Day? I do not say the same individual Particles of Matter which were united at the Point of Death; for there must be a great Alteration in them in a lingering Disease, as if a Fat Man falls into a Consumption: I do not say, the same Particles*



ticles which the Sinner had at the very time of commission of his Sins; for then a long Sinner must have a vast Body, considering the continual spending of Particles by Perspiration; but that which I suppose is implied in it is, that it must be the same Material Substance which was vitally united to the Soul here. You mention the *Hypothesis* of those, who place *Thought* in a purely *Material Animal Constitution void of Spirit*: but you agree, that the more probable Opinion is, that this *Consciousness* is annexed to the Affection of one Individual Immaterial Substance. It is very well that it is allowed to be the more probable Opinion; but it seems without any Certainty as to the Truth of it. For you have told us, what the Effect of Probability is, viz. That it is enough to induce the Mind to judge the Proposition true or false rather than the contrary; and that it is conversant about things whereof we have no Certainty, but only some Inducements to receive it for true. Thence I cannot but observe, that we have no Certainty upon your Grounds, that *Self-consciousness* depends upon an individual immaterial Substance, and consequently that a Material Substance

n. 25.

Essay, B. 4.  
ch. 15.  
Sect. 1.

Sect. 4.

may, according to your Principles, have Self-consciousness in it; at least, that you are not certain of the contrary. Now I pray consider, whether this doth not a little affect the whole Article of the *Resurrection*? For, if it may be only a Material Substance in us that thinks, then this Substance, which consists in the Life of an Organiz'd Body, must cease by Death; for how can that, which consisted in Life, be preserved afterwards? And if the *Personal Identity* consists in a *Self-consciousness* depending on such a Substance as cannot be preserved without an Organiz'd Body, then there is no Subsistence of it separate from the Body, and the Resurrection must be giving a new Life. To whom? To a Material Substance which wholly lost its Personal Identity by Death. So that here can be no *Personal Identity* at all; unless you say the very same Life which was long since at an end can be Reproduced. Which I suppose you will not assert.

But let us take *the more probable Opinion*; which I think *certain*, viz. That Self-consciousness depends upon an Immaterial Principle in us; and then the Question is, How far the Scripture determines

termines the sameness of the Body at the Resurrection, *i. e.* of that Material Substance, which was vitally united with that Immaterial Substance in this Life. The Doctrine delivered by our Saviour is, *that All that are in the Graves* John 5:28, *shall hear his voice; and shall come forth; 29. they that have done good unto the Resurrection of Life, and they that have done evil to the Resurrection of Damnation.* What is the meaning of *all that are in their Graves*? Doth this relate to any other Substance than that which was united to the Soul in Life? Can a different Substance be said to be *in the Graves* and to come out of them? Is it not material, as you say, *whether the present Self be made up of the same or other Substances*? If it be not so to your *Idea of Identity*, it is as to the Sense of our Saviour's Words: unless you can make it out, that a Substance which never was *in the Grave* may come out of it. But it may be said, *That if these Words be taken strictly they confine the Resurrection to those Particles of Matter only which were in the Grave; if not, then they may extend to another Substance.* I answer, that by comparing this with other places we find that the Words are to be understood of

2 Cor. 5.  
10.

the Substance of that Body to which the Soul was united; and not to those Individual Particles. So St. Paul, *For we must all appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

Can these words be understood of any other Material Substance, but *that Body* in which these things were done? How could it be said, if any other Substance be joyned to the Soul at the Resurrection, as its Body, that they were *the things done in or by the Body*? Curcellæus his Copy reads it, *ὁ δὲ διὰ τῆς σωματικῆς ἐπεσκέψεν*; the Complutensian *τὰ διὰ τῆς σωματικῆς*, and several of the Fathers so took it; either way, it must relate to that which was the *real Body* in which the Person lived and acted, whether *Good or Evil*. And St. Paul's Dispute about the manner of raising the Body might soon have been ended, if there were no ne-

1 Cor. 15.  
16.

cessity of the same Body. *If there be no Resurrection of the Dead, then is not Christ raised.* It seems then, other Bodies are to be raised as his was; and can there be any doubt whether his Body were the same material Substance which was united to his Soul before? And the

Apostle

Apostle lays so much weight upon it, that he saith, *if Christ be not raised your Faith is vain*; doth he mean, if there were not the same *personal Identity*, as to the Soul of Christ and the Matter united to it after the Resurrection? That cannot be his meaning, for then there would have been no necessity of Christs own Body being raised; which he asserts and proves by undoubted Witnesses. Were they Witnesses only of *some material Substance* then united to his Soul? He saith, *He was seen of five hundred Brethren at once*. What *He* was this? It was *Christ that died*. Yes, the *Person of Christ*; but *personal Identity* doth not require the same Substance, but the same Consciousness; and so if Christ were conscious to himself in another Substance, there was no necessity of the same Body. And so truly from the seeing the Person of Christ they could not prove it was the same Individual Body. But *Thomas* John 20. said, *Except I shall see in his hands the print of the Nails, and put my Finger into the print of the Nails, and thrust my Hand into his side, I will not believe*. The doing whereof convinced him it was the same Individual Body; but there will be no such proof at the great Day. And there

17.

6.

4.

25.

is no Reason there should, since the Resurrection of Christ was a sufficient proof of God's Power to raise the Dead, and the Dissimilitude of Circumstances can be no Argument against it, since the Power and Wisdom of God are concerned in it.

But the Apostle insists upon the *Resurrection of Christ*, not merely as an Argument of the Possibility of ours, but of the Certainty of it; *because he rose as the first Fruits; Christ the first Fruits, afterwards they that are Christs at his coming.* St. Paul was aware of the Objections in Mens Minds about the Resurrection of the same Body; and it is of great Consequence as to this Article, to shew upon what Grounds he proceeds. *But some Man will say, How are the Dead raised up, and with what Body do they come?* First he shews, that the seminal Parts of Plants are wonderfully improved by the ordinary Providence of God in the manner of their Vegetation: They sow bare Grain of Wheat, or of some other Grain, but God giveth it a Body, as it hath pleased him, and to every Seed his own Body. Here is an Identity of the Material Substance supposed; τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα, *that proper Body* which belongs to it; every Seed having that Body in little, which

is

1 Cor. 15.  
20, 23.

35.

36, 37, 38.

is afterwards so much enlarged; and in Grain the Seed is corrupted before its Germination; but it hath its proper *Organical Parts*, which make it the same Body with that which it grows up to. For although Grain be not divided into *Lobes* as other Seeds are, yet it hath been found, by the most Accurate Observations, that upon separating the Membranes these Seminal Parts are discerned in them; which afterwards grow up to that Body which we call *Corn*. St. Paul indeed saith, *that we sow not that Body that shall be*; but he speaks not of the *Identity* but the *Perfection* of it. And although there be such a difference from the Grain it self, when it comes up to be perfect Corn with Root, Stalk, Blade and Ear, that it may be said to outward Appearance not to be the same Body, yet with regard to the Seminal and Organical Parts, it is as much the same as a Man grown up is the same with the *Embryo* in the Womb. And although many Arguments may be used to prove, that a Man is not the same, because Life which depends upon the course of the Blood and the manner of Respiration and Nutrition is so different in both States, yet that Man would  
be

- be thought Ridiculous that should seriously affirm, that it was not the same Man. And you grant, *that the variation of great parcels of Matter in Plants, alters not the Identity: and that the Organization of the Parts in one coherent Body partaking of one common Life makes the Identity of a Plant*; so that in things capable of any sort of Life, the *Identity* is consistent with a continued succession of Parts; and so the Wheat grown up is the same Body with the Grain that was sown. And thus the Alteration of the Parts of the Body at the *Resurrection* is consistent with its *Identity*, if its *Organization* and *Life* be the same; and this is a *Real Identity* of the Body which depends not upon *Consciousness*. From whence it follows, that to make the same Body, no more is required but restoring Life to the *Organized Parts* of it. And
- Sect. 6. you grant likewise, *That the Identity of the same Man consists in a Participation of the same continued Life by constantly fleeting Particles of Matter in Succession vitally united to the same Organized Body*. So that there is no difficulty as to the sameness of the Body, if Life were continued; and if by Divine Power Life be restored to that Material Substance which



which was before united, by a Re-union of the Soul to it, there is no Reason to deny the Identity of the Body. Not from the Consciousness of the Soul, but from that Life which is the Result of the Union of Soul and Body. But St. Paul still supposes that it must be that Material Substance to which the Soul was before united. For saith he, *It is sown in Corruption, it is raised in Incorruption:* 42.  
*It is sown in Dishonour, it is raised in Glory;* 43.  
*It is sown in Weakness, it is raised in Power;* 44.  
*It is sown a Natural Body, it is raised a Spiritual Body.* Can such a Material Substance which was never united to the Body be said to be *sown in Corruption*, and *Weakness*, and *Dishonour*? Either therefore he must speak of the same Body, or his meaning cannot be comprehended. For what doth all this relate to a *Conscious Principle*? The Apostle speaks plainly of that Body which was once quickened and afterwards falls to Corruption; and is to be restored with more noble Qualities. *For this Corruptible must put on Incorruption, and this Mortal must put on Immortality.* 53, 54. I do not see how he could more expressly affirm the Identity of this Corruptible Body, with that after the Resurrection, and that

that without any Respect to the Principle of *Self-consciousness*; and so if the Scripture be the sole Foundation of our Faith, this is an Article of it, and so it hath been always understood by the Christian Church. And your *Idea* of *Personal Identity* is inconsistent with it; for it makes the same Body which was here united to the Soul not to be necessary to the Doctrine of the *Resurrection*, but any Material Substance being united to the same Principle of *Consciousness* makes the same Body. The Dispute is not, how far *Personal Identity* in it self may consist in the very same Material Substance; for we allow the Notion of *Personal Identity* to belong to the same Man under several changes of Matter; but whether it doth not depend upon a *Vital Union* between the Soul and Body and the Life which is consequent upon it; and therefore in the *Resurrection* the same Material Substance must be reunited; or else it cannot be called a *Resurrection*, but a *Renovation*; i. e. it may be a *New Life*, but not a *raising the Body from the Dead*.

2. The next Articles of Faith which your Notion of *Ideas* is inconsistent with, are no less than those of the *Trinity*, and  
of

of the Incarnation of our Saviour. The former by the first Article of our Church is expressed *by three Persons in the Unity of the Divine Nature*: the latter is said Art. 2. to be *by the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature in one Person*. Let us now see whether your *Ideas* of *Nature* and *Person* can consist with these. But before I come to that I must endeavour to set this Matter right, as to the Dispute about the Notion of *Nature* and *Person*, which you have endeavour'd with all your Art, to perplex and confound, and have brought in several *Interlocutors* to make it look more like an Entertainment. Of which afterwards: The Original Question was, whether we could come to any Certainty about the Distinction of *Nature* and *Person* in the *Way of Ideas*; and my business was to prove that we could not, because we had no *simple Ideas by Sensation or Reflection*, Essay B. 2. c. 1. Sect. 5. without which you affirm that our Understanding seems to you not to have the least Glimmering of *Ideas*: and that we have nothing in our Minds which did not come in one of these two Ways.

These are your own Words. And then I undertook to shew, that it was not possible for us to have any simple Ideas Vindication of the Trinity, p. 252. &c.  
of

of *Nature* and *Person* by *Sensation* or *Reflection*: and that whether we consider'd *Nature* as taken for Essential Properties, or for that Substance wherein that Property lies: whether we consider it in distinct Individuals or abstractly; still my Design was to shew that in your Way of *Ideas*, you could come to no Certainty about them. And as to *Person* I shew'd, that the Distinction of Individuals is not founded meerly on what occurs to our Senses, but upon a different manner of Subsistence, which is in one Individual, and is not communicable to another: And as to this I said, that we may find within our selves an intelligent Substance by inward Perception; but whether that make a Person or not, must be understood some other way; for if the meer intelligent Substance make a Person, then there cannot be the Union of two such Natures, but there must be two Persons. Which is repugnant to the Article of the Incarnation of our Saviour.

That this was the true State of the Question will appear to any one that will vouchsafe to look into it. But what said you in your first Letter in Answer to it?

As to Nature you say, *That it is a* Letter 1. P. 165.  
*Collection of several Ideas combined into*  
*one complex, abstract Idea, which when*  
*they are found united in any Individual*  
*existing, though joyned in that Existence*  
*with several other Ideas, that individual*  
*or particular Being is truly said to have*  
*the Nature of a Man, or the Nature of a*  
*Man to be in him; forasmuch as these sim-*  
*ple Ideas are found united in him, which*  
*answer the complex, abstract Idea, to which*  
*the specifick Name is given by any one :*  
*which abstract specifick Idea, he keeps the*  
*same when he applies the specifick Name*  
*standing for it to distinct Individuals.*

And as to Person, *in the way of Ideas,* P. 216.  
*you say, that the Word Person in it self*  
*signifies nothing, and so no Idea belonging*  
*to it, nothing can be said to be the true*  
*Idea of it. But as soon as the common Use*  
*of any Language has appropriated it to*  
*any Idea, then that is the true Idea of a*  
*Person, and so of Nature.*

Against this I objected in my Answer Answer to Letter 1. P. 103.  
*to that Letter, that if these Terms really*  
*signifie nothing in themselves, but are*  
*only abstract and complex Ideas, which*  
*the common Use of Language hath ap-*  
*propriated to be the signs of two Ideas;*  
*then it is plain that they are only Notions*  
*of*

Letter 2.  
P. 109.

of the Mind, as all abstracted and complex Ideas are; and so one Nature and three Persons can be no more.

To this you answer in your second Letter, *That your Notion of the Terms Nature and Person is, that they are two sounds that naturally signifie not one thing more than another, nor in themselves signifie any thing at all, but have the signification which they have barely by Imposition.* Whoever imagined that Words signifie any otherwise than by Imposition?

But the Question is, whether these be meer *Words* and *Names*, or not? Or whether there be not a real Foundation in things for such a Distinction between *Nature* and *Person*? Of which I gave this evident Proof, that if it were not the same Nature in different Individuals, every Individual must make a different Kind.

P. 100.

And what Answer do you give to this plain Reason? Nothing particular that I can find. But in the general you say, *that all that you can find that I except against in your Notion of Nature and Person is nothing but this, viz. that these are two sounds which in themselves signifie nothing.* And is this all indeed? Did not I tell you in these Words, ( which I am forced to repeat on this occasion, although I am

very

very unwilling to fill Pages with Repetitions. ) " The Question now between  
 " us comes to this, whether the common  
 " Nature or Essence of things lies only  
 " in an abstract Idea, or a general Name,  
 " and the real Essence consists only in  
 " particular Beings from which that Nature  
 " is abstracted? The Question is  
 " not whether in forming the Notion of  
 " common Nature, the Mind doth not  
 " abstract from the Circumstances of particular  
 " Beings; but it is whether there  
 " be not an Antecedent Foundation in the  
 " Nature of things, upon which we form  
 " this abstract Idea? For if there be,  
 " then it cannot be called an Universal  
 " Name only; or a meer sign of an Idea,  
 " which we have formed from putting  
 " many simple Ideas together,  
 " which Name belongs to all of such a  
 " sort, as have those simple Ideas united  
 " together.

*Answer to  
 Letter 1.  
 p. 107.*

In these Words, which you cannot deny to be in the place mention'd, I thought I had stated the Case fairly between us. And why do you not return an Answer to them? But instead of that you only mention another Passage more liable to cavilling, where I say, " That upon your Notions of Nature and Person, I do not see

D

" how

P. 103.

“ how it is possible to defend the Do-  
 “ ctrine of the Trinity. For if these  
 “ Terms really signifie nothing in them-  
 “ selves, but are only abstract and com-  
 “ plex Ideas, which the common Use of  
 “ Language hath appropriated to be the  
 “ sign of two Ideas ; then it is plain that  
 “ they are only Notions of the Mind, as  
 “ all abstract and complex Ideas are ; and  
 “ so one Nature and three Persons can be  
 “ no more.

Letter 2.  
 P. 112.

Letter 1.  
 P. 27.

Upon this you charge me with affir-  
 ming that of you which you never said,  
*viz. that these Terms are only abstract or  
 complex Ideas: but your Words are, Ta-  
 king therefore Nature and Person for the  
 sign of two Ideas they are put to stand for:  
 and by enumerating all the simple Ideas,  
 that are contained in the complex Idea,  
 that each of them is made to stand for, we  
 shall immediately see the whole difference  
 that is between them.*

These are your own Words. Now from  
 thence it appears, that *Nature and Per-  
 son* are Terms which are the signs of two  
 Ideas by your own Confession: *but you  
 never made these, or any other Terms to be  
 Ideas: and you should be ashamed of such  
 Jargon.*

But



But have not you said in your Essay, <sup>Essay B. 4. c. 6. Sect. 1.</sup> that it is a very common Practice for Names to be made use of instead of the Ideas themselves, especially if the Ideas be very complex. Nature and Person you grant to be complex Ideas; and these Terms you confess are appropriated to be the signs of two Ideas: Therefore here is an Ambiguity in the Use of these Words, for they are complex Ideas themselves, and they are made the signs of them; and so the Words of the Sentence are capable of both those Senses.

For it is true, according to you, that these Terms, Nature and Person, really signify nothing in themselves, but are only complex and abstract Ideas; and those Terms are appropriated to be the signs of two Ideas. So that Nature and Person are both Ideas themselves, and those Terms are the Signs of two Ideas: and the Sense had not been liable to Exception, if *And* had been inserted; "For if these Terms really signify nothing in themselves, but are only abstract and complex Ideas; *And* which the common Use had appropriated to be the Signs of two Ideas, &c. But whether this be properly expressed or not, according to your Sense of Ideas, the Weight of the Controver-

he depends not at all upon it ; but whether *Nature* and *Person* can be any other but *abstract Ideas*, according to your own plain Expressions ; and if they are so, they are no more than Notions of the Mind, and then the Consequence must hold, that *One Nature* and *three Persons* can be no more. Upon which I said, I did not see how it was possible to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity, ( and I now add of the *Incarnation* ) which was the thing I undertook to make out.

Letter 2.  
p. 113.

But you very freely say, *whether I rightly deduce from it this Consequence, viz. And so one Nature and three Persons can be no more ; is what you neither know nor are concerned to examin.* Which I think is an Expression could hardly drop from a Person, who did know how to declare his Belief of *three Persons in the Unity of the Divine Nature*. But you pretend *these are none of your Notions of Nature and Person, nor indeed any thing you can understand.* But it is plain, that this Consequence follows from your own Notions of *Nature* and *Person* ; as they are set down expressly by your self in the former Letter.

p. 109.

You tell me, *I made this Inference a little in haste !* Whether a Man write in  
haste

*haste* or not, the World will judge by what appears, and not by what he or any other saith. And I think it will appear, that I did not make this Inference *in haste*, but from a deliberate Consideration of your Notion of the Ideas of *Nature* and *Person*. But by *those Terms signifying nothing in themselves*, you say, that you meant, that they are two sounds that naturally signify not one thing more than another, nor in themselves signify any thing at all, but have the signification which they have barely by *Imposition*. And was this truly all that you meant by it? And do you think that *Peter*, and *James*, and *John* signify any thing by *Nature*? Are not all Words made significative by *Imposition*? But is there no difference in the signification of Words as they stand for signs of Things? If they be Words for *particular Substances*, then you grant, that there is something really existing which is meant by those Words; but if they relate only to the Conceptions of the Mind, then they signify them and no more. And the Question is, which of these two you meant by those Words *Nature* and *Person*? And you plainly affirm both of them to be *complex Ideas*, which are made only by an Act of the

D 3

Mind,

Mind, and therefore your meaning can be no otherwise understood.

- You presume, that upon more leisurely thoughts, both my self and the rest of Mankind will concur with you. I never affected Singularity, and am ready to comply with the rest of Mankind in any reasonable thing. But you say, that this Notion of Nature and Person, That they are two Words that signifie only by Imposition, is what will hold in the common Sense of Mankind. No doubt of it : But I must again and again tell you, that is not the Point in Question, but whether they are only abstract and complex Ideas, which have no other Being but in the Mind. And to this you answer not a Word. I do not in the least think as you suggest,*
- P. 110. *that it is necessary to the Defense of the Trinity, that these two Articulate Sounds should have Natural significations, and that unless they are used in those significations, it were impossible to defend the Doctrine of the Trinity. But I do affirm, that those who make Nature and Person to be only abstract and complex Ideas ; can neither defend nor reasonably believe it. And*
- P. 111. *this is making no extraordinary Supposition necessary to the Belief or Defence of it ; but only that which in the common*
- Sense

Sense of Mankind is necessary to it. For, if you have expressed your own Mind in your former Letter; that must guide us in your Notion of *Nature* and *Person*, where you undertook to explain them. For if *Nature* and *Person* be *abstract*, and *complex Ideas*, as you say, and such are only Acts of the Mind, I do not see how it is possible for you to reconcile these Notions with the Articles of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation*.

I do not go about to accuse you of *denying these Doctrines*; I hope you do not. But I impute all this Hesitancy, and doubting only to your *Notions of Ideas*; which you had been so long forming in your Mind, that as it often happens in such Cases, one darling favourite Notion proves too hard for some Points of far greater Consequence, when they are found inconsistent with it. And because you had first fixed your Notion of *Ideas*, and taken much Pains about them, you thought all other things were to be entertained as they appear'd consistent with them. But you could not but find, that the Articles of *three Persons*, and *one Nature*; and two *Natures*, and one *Person*, were not reconcileable with your *Ideas of Nature and Person*; which is that they

are *complex Ideas*, which depend upon the Act of the Mind ; for this were to make the *two Natures in Christ* to be only two *complex Ideas*. For if *Nature*, as you say, be a *Collection of several Ideas combined into one complex, abstract Idea* ; then two Natures can be nothing else but two such *Collections*, or two *abstracted and complex Ideas*. It may be said, that when you make *Nature an abstracted and complex Idea*, you speak of a *specifick Idea*, but the *Humane Nature in Christ* was a particular Substance, and this you assert to be a real thing, and not to depend on the Act of the Mind.

Letter I.  
p. 32.

But this doth not clear the Matter. For in your former Letter you said, that all the *Ideas we have of particular distinct Substances*, are nothing but several *Combinations of simple Ideas* : which in Corporeal Substances are *sensible Qualities*, in Incorporeal are *Operations of the Mind*. The utmost then which the Idea of *Humane Nature in Christ* comes to is, that there were in him the *sensible Qualities and Intellectual Operations* of a Man, with an unknown Substance to support them : which belongs not to the simple Ideas, but is supposed by them. This is all I can make of your way of Ideas : and so  
the

the Incarnation of Christ is the assuming the sensible Qualities, and intellectual Operations of a Man, to which a *Substratum* doth belong: but is no Part of the simple Ideas. So that we can have no *Idea* at all of the *Humane Nature of Christ*; but only an Inference, that since those are but Accidents, there must be a *Substratum* to support them; and consequently there was a *particular Substance* in him made up of Mind and Body. But if this had come in the Way of Ideas, yet it cannot make out the *Humane Nature of Christ*. For if it were in him no otherwise than in other Men, then the *Mystery of the Incarnation* is quite gone, and Christ is to be consider'd but like other Men; which doth not answer to what the Scripture saith of the *Word's being made Flesh*, and that *God was manifest in the Flesh*. There must be therefore something beyond the meer Humane Nature in him; and either it must be only some Divine Operation upon, and with it, and that is *no Substance*; or if it be a Substance, it must either cohabit with it, or else be united to it. If it only co-habits, then there are two Persons dwelling together in one Body, and the Actions of one cannot be attributed

buted to the other ; If there be a real Union between them, so as the Acts belong to *one Person* ; then there must be such a Manner of Existence in the Humane Nature of Christ, which is different from it in other Persons. For in all others, the Acts belong to the Humane Person ; but if it were so in Christ, then the Divine Acts of Christ must flow from the Humane Nature as the Principle of them ; which is to confound the Divine and Humane Nature, and Operations together ; If they come from the Divine Person, then the Humane Nature must have another kind of Subsistence, than it hath in others, or else there must be two Persons ; and *Person* being as you say, a *Forensick Term*, there must be two different Capacities of Rewards and Punishments ; which is so absurd an Opinion as I think no one will assert.

*Essay* 1. 2.  
ch. 27.  
Sect. 26.

If there be then but *one Person* and *two Natures*, how can you possibly reconcile this to your Way of Ideas ? *Person*, say you, *in it self signifies nothing* ; but as soon as the common use of any Language has appropriated it to any Idea, then that is the true Idea of a *Person*, i.e. Men may call a *Person* what they please, for there is nothing but common use required

*Letter* 1.  
p. 216.



quired to it: They may call *a Horse*, or *a Tree*, or *a Stone a Person* if they think fit; but since the common use of Language hath appropriated it to an *Intelligent Being*, that is, *a Person*.

And so you tell us, *That Person stands* Essay, l. 2. ch. 27. Sect. 9.  
*for a Thinking Intelligent Being that hath Reason and Reflection, and can consider it self as it self, the same thinking Being in different times and places.* How comes *Person to stand for this* and nothing else? From whence comes *Self-consciousness in different times and places* to make up this *Idea* of a *Person*? Whether it be true or false, I am not now to enquire, but how it comes into this *Idea* of a *Person*? Hath *the common use of our Language appropriated it to this Sense*? If not, this seems to be a meer *Arbitrary Idea*; and may as well be denied as affirmed. And what a fine pass are we come to in the *Way of Ideas*, if a meer *Arbitrary Idea* must be taken into the only true *Method of Certainty*? But of that afterwards. We now proceed in the *Way of Ideas* as you give it us. But if this be the true *Idea* of a *Person*, then there can be no Union of two Natures in one *Person*: For if an *Intelligent Conscious Being* be the *Idea* of

of a Person ; and the Divine and Human Nature be Intelligent Conscious Beings, then the Doctrine of the Union of *two Natures and one Person* is quite sunk, for here must be two Persons in this Way of Ideas. Again, if this be the Idea of a Person, then where there are three Persons, there must be three distinct Intelligent Beings ; and so there cannot be three Persons in the same individual Essence. And thus both these Doctrines of the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* are past recovery gone, if this Way of *Ideas* hold. So great a difference there is, between forming Ideas first, and then judging of Revelation by them ; and the believing of Revelation on its proper Grounds, and interpreting the Sense of it by the due Measures of Reason. You may pretend what you please, that you hold the *Affurance of Faith*, and the *Certainty by Ideas* to go upon very different Grounds ; but when a Proposition is offered you out of Scripture to be believed, and you doubt about the Sense of it, Is not Recourse to be made to your *Ideas* ? As, in the present Case, whether there can be *three Persons in one Nature*, or *two Natures and one Person* ; what Resolution can you come to upon your Principles,

ciples, but in the Way of *Ideas*? You may possibly say, *That where Ideas are clear and distinct, there you are to judge of Revelation by them*; and this is what you assert in your *Essay*, *That in Propositions whose Certainty is built on clear and perfect Ideas and evident Deductions of Reason, there no Proposition can be received for Divine Revelation which contradicts them*; from hence you conclude it impossible for the same Body to be in two Places at once. And yet there is a Person who hath lately told the World, that there is one certain secret Way how by Divine Power, the same Body, but not the same Person, may be in very distant Places at once; but he is advised to keep it up as a Secret; which was good friendly Advice: But till it be discovered there is no judging of it. Here I observe, that you require *clear and distinct Ideas*; and yet we find, if a Man's Word may be taken, these *clear and distinct Ideas* do not prove the thing impossible. But what is to be said when the *Ideas* are not *clear and distinct*? You say, *Your Method of Certainty is by the Agreement or Disagreement of Ideas, where they are not in all their Parts perfectly clear and distinct*. And this is your Secret about Certainty

*Essay*, B. 4.  
ch. 18.  
Sect. 5.

*Evangel.*  
*Medici*  
Art. 14.  
p. 170.

Ch. 18.  
Sect. 10.

Certainty; which I think had been better kept up too: For I pray, in the Case now before us, Are your *Ideas* of *Nature* and *Person* clear and distinct or not? if they are, then it is plain from your own Doctrine, that if Revelation be pretended, you are to reject it. How then comes the *Certainty of Faith* to be preserved firm and immoveable, although the *Grounds of Certainty* be disputed? But suppose they are not clear and distinct? What is to be done in a Matter of Revelation contrary to your *Ideas*? Are you to submit to the *Revelation* or not? *Whatever God hath Revealed is most certainly true, no doubt can be made of it. This is the proper Object of Faith; but whether it be a Divine Revelation or no, you say, Reason must judge.* Yes, Reason proceeding upon clear and distinct *Ideas*. But suppose you have *Ideas* sufficient for Certainty in your Way, but not clear and distinct; what is to be done then? *In things that are above Reason*, you say, *when they are Revealed, they are proper Matters of Faith.* What is here being above Reason? Either above the Discovery of Reason. as the *Fall of Angels, the Resurrection of the Body, &c.* and about these, you say, *Reason*

son hath nothing to do. (What not if there be an *Idea of Identity* as to the Body ?) Or such as are above the Comprehension of Reason when discovered. And they are either such as we have no Natural Ideas of ; and then you grant, *that they are pure Matters of Faith* ; or they are such, as you have *certain Ideas* of, but *not clear and distinct*. Now here lies the pinching Difficulty, as to your *Way of Ideas*. You say indeed, *That Re-* Sect. 8.  
*velation must carry it against meer Probabilities to the contrary ; because the Mind not being certain of the Truth of that it doth not evidently know, but is only probably convinced of, is bound to give up its Assent to such a Testimony, which it is satisfied comes from one who cannot err and will not deceive.* I pray observe your own Words, you here positively say, *That the Mind not being certain of the Truth of that it doth not evidently know* : So that it is plain here, that you place Certainty only in Evident Knowledge, or in *clear and distinct Ideas* ; and yet your great Complaint of Me was, that I charged this upon you, and now I find it in your own Words (which I observed before.) But let us allow you all you desire, *viz. That there may be Certainty*  
by

by *Ideas*, where they are not clear and distinct: and let us now suppose that you are to judge of a *Proposition* delivered as a Matter of Faith, where you have a *Certainty by Reason* from your *Ideas*, such as they are: Can you assent to this as a Matter of Faith, when you are already certain by your *Ideas* of the contrary? How is this possible? Can you believe that to be true, which you are certain is not true? Suppose it be that there are *two Natures in one Person*; the Question is, Whether you can Assent to this as a Matter of Faith? If you had said, there had been only *Probabilities* on the other side, I grant that you then say, *Revelation is to prevail*; but when you say you have *Certainty by Ideas* to the contrary, I do not see how it is possible for you to Assent to a Matter of Faith as true, when you are certain from your *Ideas* that it is not true: For how can you Believe against Certainty? The *Evidence* is not so great as when the *Ideas* are clear and distinct, but the Bar against Assent is as strong; because the Mind is actually determined by *Certainty*. And so your Notion of *Certainty by Ideas* must overthrow the Credibility of a Matter of Faith in all such Propositions

ons which are offered to be believed on the account of Divine Revelation.

I shall now summ up the Force of what I have said about this Matter.

Your Answer is, *That your Method of Certainty by Ideas, shakes not at all, nor in the least concerns the Assurance of Faith.* Against this I have pleaded. (1.) That your Method of *Certainty* shakes the Belief of Revelation in general. (2.) That it shakes the Belief of Particular Propositions or Articles of Faith, which depend upon the Sense of Words contained in Scripture. Because you do not say, that we are to believe all that we find there expressed; but in case we have any clear and distinct Ideas which limit the Sense another way than the words seem to carry it, we are to judge that to be the true Sense. But in case our Ideas are not clear and distinct, yet you affirm as your proper Doctrine, *That we may come to Certainty by Ideas, although not in all Respects perfectly clear and distinct.* From whence I infer, That where you have attained to a Certainty by your imperfect Ideas, you must judge of a Matter of Faith, by those *Ideas*, and consequently, if the Union of *two Natures* and *one Person*, or *three Persons*

*in one Nature* be repugnant to your *I-deas* (as I have shewed that they are) you must by virtue of your own *Principles* reject these from being Matters of Faith. And thus I hope I have proved what I undertook, *viz.* That your Notion of *Certainty by Ideas* is inconsistent with these Articles of the Christian Faith.

But you have this Comfort left, that you are not the first Person who hath run himself into insuperable Difficulties as to *Matters of Faith*, by this way of *I-deas*. For *Des Cartes* himself did so in a remarkable manner: He was a Person of a great Reach and Capacity, and spent many Thoughts in laying the Foundations of *Certainty from Ideas*, both as to *Incorporeal* and *Corporeal Substances*; and yet was miserably foiled as to both of them. His Demonstrations from his *I-deas* in his *Metaphysical Meditations*, did not meet with the Entertainment he promised himself from the Inquisitive part of Mankind; for his *Objective Reality* from his *Idea* gave no Satisfaction; and his other Argument was thought to have no Force, unless it were taken off from the *Idea* and placed upon the Necessity of Existence in the Nature of the Thing. As to *Corporeal Substances*, his  
fundamen-



fundamental mistake was in a wrong *Idea* of *Matter*, which he made to be the same with *Extension* ; and upon this he built his *Systeme of Nature*. But against this first false step many things were objected by his Adversaries, as may be seen by the late Disputes in *France* about his *Principles* ; they objected , that his Notion or *Idea* of *Matter* made it *necessary*, and impossible for God to *Annihilate it* ; and his Defenders are driven to such shifts as to *God's Will and Power*, that an indifferent Person might thereby see how dangerous it is to take up with *Ideas* as to the Ground of Certainty, although neither himself nor his Followers pretend to place it in any thing but *clear and distinct Ideas*. But when they came to reconcile their *Ideas* with Matters of Faith, they were so plunged, that they could see no way to get through their Difficulties. For as Monsieur Hu-

Censur.  
Philos.  
Cartes. c. 8.  
Sect. 3. n. 4.

et observes, *Although Des Cartes professes great Submission to Divine Revelation, yet when it came to the Trial, he judged his Opinions could not be repugnant to it, because he was certain of the Truth of them ; which shews, that he judged of Revelation by his Rules of Certainty, and whatever he pretended, he did not take*

*his Measures of Truth from Revelation.* A late Defender of *Des Cartes* in answer to this, produces the Words used by him in his Principles, wherein he owns, *That in case of Divine Revelation if God declares any thing concerning himself or others which exceed our Capacity, as the Mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, he would not refuse to believe them, although he could not clearly understand them.*

This Monsieur *Huet* denies not, viz. *That he made such a general Profession of Submission to Revelation and owning the Mysteries of Faith; but, saith he, when it comes to particular Points, then Ideas are to be the Standard by which we are to judge of Revelation.* Monsieur *Regis* in his Reply saith, *That Matters of Faith and Philosophical Truths are of different kinds; and that there can be no Contrariety but between things of the same kind.* Which makes him run into that great Absurdity, that although in a *Philosophical Sense* God cannot do things repugnant to Reason, yet in the Way of Faith he may; and all this to preserve the *Certainty by Ideas*, when nothing can be more repugnant to all kinds of Certainty than such a Supposition. But another

ther great Admirer of *Des Cartes*, thinks <sup>Philoso-</sup> this way unreasonable; But *Des Cartes*, <sup>phia Scri-</sup> he saith, *bath shewn the right Method of* <sup>pturæ In-</sup> *Certainty by clear and distinct Ideas*, and <sup>terpres, c.</sup> therefore he calls it no less than a *Di-* <sup>s. n. 56.</sup> *vine Certainty*; and he adds, *that Truth* <sup>c. 8.</sup> *cannot be contrary to it self*; and he laughs at the Distinction of *Philosophical* and *Theological Truths*; or the two ways of Certainty by Knowledge and Faith: For, *Truth is always one and the same, and changes not its Countenance: and if Truth be an Agreement of Words with Things, how can the same Words agree in one Book and differ in another? for the same God is the Author of Truth where-ever it is: and therefore he calls it, A most absurd Opinion of those who say, that God who is immutable should teach that as Truth in Philosophy, which is false in Divinity.* But I return to you.

You seem to be not a little concerned, that I say, "That as you have stated your Notion of Ideas it may be of dangerous Consequence to that Article of the Christian Faith which I had endeavoured to defend. Such an Accusation, you say, brought into any Court in England, would be thought to shew a great Inclination to have the Accused be

*suspected rather than any Evidence of being guilty of any thing; and so would immediately be dismissed without hearing any Plea to it.* But you must give me leave to say, that you have quite mistaken my Design, which was not to accuse you, but to shew my own Dissatisfaction, as to the Way you had taken to clear your self. I hoped you would have said so much for your own Vindication, as would have satisfied the World, that your *Notion of Ideas* was far from any Tendency that way to which it was carried by him who made use of your Expressions: But, instead of that you explained it in such a manner as made it far more suspicious that he had not perverted your meaning. And that made me to say, That as you had stated it, *it may be* of dangerous Consequence. *It may be*, say you, *this is no Evidence, but only an Inclination to accuse you.* So far from it, that it shewed an Inclination to favour you, when I only said *it may be*; for now you see, that I think *it is* of such dangerous Consequence, and I must think so till you have cleared it better.

p. 58.

*But the Notion of Ideas as you have stated it, relates to your whole Book:*  
Why

Why should you carry it farther than I intended it? *The stating* of it I mentioned was in *your first Letter*; where you told us what you meant by *Nature* and *Person*. But you have found out *two* p. 60.  
*Particulars wherein it may be of dangerous Consequence, first in making so much use of the word Ideas, and your placing Certainty in Ideas.* As to the *Term of Ideas*, I have no Objection to the use of the word it self; provided it be used in a common Sense, and no Weight be laid upon it more than it can bear; for I am for no new affected *Terms* which are apt to carry Mens Minds out of the way; they are like *Ignes fatui*, which seem to give Light, but lead those that follow them into Bogs: Like *Fontanges*, which seem to set Peoples Heads that wear them higher, but their Understandings are just what they were before. I always dislik'd the *Stoical* Improvements by *New Words*, or giving *New Senses* to *Old ones*. But I told you, "I should never have mention'd this Way of *Ideas*,  
 "but for the ill use I found made of  
 "them: and you might have enjoy'd  
 "the Satisfaction you had in them long  
 "enough, unless I had found them im-  
 "ploy'd in doing Mischief. *Which,* p. 63.  
you

*you humbly conceive amounts to that much and no more ; that I fear Ideas ; i. e. the Term Ideas may some time or other be of dangerous Consequence.* Can you possibly think this was my Meaning? I know of no Antipathy I have to the *Term Ideas* ; nor do I understand any *Mischief* that lies in the bare use of the Term. If it gives you any Satisfaction I pray make what use you please of it, so you do not set it up in your Way of Ideas for a new Method of Certainty ; nor weaken Mens Belief as to Matters of Faith by it. These were my *Prejudices* against your *Ideas*, and they are increased by your Defences ; for I can find nothing that hath any force to remove them.

You tell me, my Quarrel must be *with the Term Ideas as of dangerous Consequence* : But why so? It was *the Way of Certainty by Ideas* which I insisted upon, and the *new Terms* as imploy'd to that purpose. I confess, I say, " The World " had been strangely amuzed with Ideas " of late, and we have been told, what " strange things might be done by the help " of Ideas, *i. e.* as to Matter of Certainty. But you tell me more than once, that I own, *That these come only to be common Notions of things*, which I have no A-  
version

version from. This is a way of turning things upon Me, which I could not expect from You. For those Words are brought in by me on this Occasion, you had said, *that you see no such Opposition, but that Ideas and sound Reason may stand together, i.e. Reason rightly managing those Ideas, so as to produce Evidence by them.* Upon this, I used these Words. “ But “ what need all this great Noise about “ Ideas and Certainty; true and real “ Certainty by Ideas, if after all it comes “ only to this, that our Ideas only re- “ present such things, from whence we “ bring Arguments to prove the Truth “ of things? But the World hath been “ strangely amused, &c. Judge now how fair and ingenuous this Answer is. That which I bring in as a Consequence of your Assertion, you make to be my own Sense as to *your Notion of Ideas*; when I all along distinguish the *Way of Reason*, by deducing one thing from another, from your *Way of Certainty, in the Agreement and Disagreement of Ideas*; and I therefore mention it as an Argument of your own departing from your beloved Notion of Ideas. I never said any thing against *Reason rightly managing Ideas, so as to produce Evidence by them.* I was glad  
you

From p.  
63. to p.  
73.

p. 87.

you came so far towards my own Apprehension as to the Use of Ideas, and I declare soon after " That if you mean " no more by your Certainty from Ideas, " but a Certainty from Reason, I was " not so unreasonable a Man to disagree " with you. And yet you spend many Pages to justify your Use of the Term *Ideas* : which is all lost upon me. For in short, it is not your *Way of Ideas*, but your *Way of Certainty by Ideas*, which I was unsatisfied about, and am so much the more by the Method you have taken to defend your self. And this was the thing I found fault with, as you could not but see; but you found it much easier to run into a long Discourse, to no purpose, about the Use of the Word *Ideas*. How far your Use of the Term is new I will not dispute with you; be it new or old the thing you do pretend to by your Ideas is that which I disliked, and am forced to do so still; for you give me no manner of satisfaction about it, as will appear by the Examination of what you say, about the *new Method of Certainty*, which is the matter in Question: You desire to know *whether there be any other or older Method of Certainty*? That is not the Point,



Point, but whether yours be any at all? Which I deny. *If there be no Older, you say, the World is obliged to you for this New one:* Very true, if it were what it pretends. But you tell me, *I ought to set the World right in a thing of that great Concernment, and to overthrow yours, and thereby prevent the dangerous Consequence of your unseasonable starting this new Method of Certainty.* I did never pretend to inform the World of *new Methods*, and therefore am not bound to go any farther than to that I found fault with, which was your *new Method*; and although I thought I had said enough before, to shew how far it was from what it pretended; yet because you call me to it in such a manner, I shall endeavour more freely to represent to you the *Unsatisfactoriness* and *Inconsistency* of it. For it is still to me a strange thing, that you should talk so much of a *new Method of Certainty* by *Ideas*; and yet allow, as you do, such a *Want of Ideas*, so much *Imperfection* in them, and such a *want of Connexion between our Ideas, and the things themselves.* One would think, that he that owned these things rather design'd to prove there could be no Certainty by Ideas. And when I had ob-  
jected

jected these things in the Conclusion of my former Answer, you do not deny them; and all the Return you make is, *that it is better to have some way of Certainty ( though it will not lead us to it in every thing ) than no way at all.* As though the Dispute between us had been, Whether any Certainty be not better than none. No doubt any true Certainty is desirable, but it is, as I have often said, of ill Consequence to set up such a Method of Certainty, as if it hold, will overthrow our Faith, and if it doth not, must deceive all those that follow it. And it is the Certainty of Faith which I defend against your pretended Certainty of Knowledge. But to let you see what Ground I had to be unsatisfied with it, I shall now wave all the Instances of *Ideas* I insisted on before, as to *Substances* and *sensible Qualities*; and I shall single out one remarkable *Idea*, by which the Uncertainty of your way of *Ideas* will be fully discover'd. And that is the *Idea* of *Space*; upon which a famous *Systeme* of *Natural Philosophy* hath been built, and as upon a clear and distinct *Idea*; and yet you will by no means allow it to be so; and think you have a clear *Idea* to the contrary; although

though those who will not allow it to be true cannot deny it to be consistent with it self, and that the *Ideas* in it have an *Agreement* with one another.

As to *Space*, you say, that we have it both by *Sight* and *Touch*, which inform us of the *Distance* between *Bodies*: which in several *Respects* may be called *Distance*, *Capacity* and *Extension*; and so *Extension*, you say, is an *Idea* belonging to *Body* only, but *Space* may, as is evident, be consider'd without it. But here now arises a great difficulty to me in the way of *Certainty* by *Ideas*: viz. that some very thinking Men in this way of *Ideas*, have look'd on the *Idea* of *Space*, and *extended Matter* to be the same; for say they, it appears to us from *clear Ideas*, that *Body* and *Extension* are the same thing, and therefore if there be *Extension* in *Space* there must be *Body*. But, you say, those that do so, either change the *signification* of *Words*, and so render it a doubtfull *Idea*, or they confound very different *Ideas* with one another, and so can never come to *Certainty* by the *Agreement* or *Disagreement* of *Ideas*. But you conclude, that the *clear* and *distinct Idea* of *simple Space* distinguishes it plainly and sufficiently from *Body*. Here we see you pretend

Essay, B. 2.  
ch. 13.  
Sect. 2.

Sect. 12.

Sect. 14.

Princip.  
p. 11. n. 16.

pretend to a *clear and distinct Idea*. But it falls out very unluckily for *the Way of Ideas*, that the first starter of this Way of Certainty is as positive, *that the Idea of Space and extended Body are the same*. So that here we have *clear and distinct Ideas* both Ways. And is not this an admirable Method of Certainty, when in one of the plainest *Ideas* which depend upon our Senses, the greatest Defenders of *Ideas* differ so fundamentally. What can other Men hope for in *this Way of Ideas*, if such Men can agree no better in one of the most evident to our Senses? But then we must consider, *who hath the better Reason?* This is not Certainty by *Ideas*, but by *Reason* upon them, which is another thing: Let us go to Reason. Is that Reason built only on some *intermediate Idea*, which makes it clear? I find *intermediate Ideas* on both sides, and urged with equal Assurance. Des Cartes saith, *that from Extension we rightly conclude a Body to be a Substance; because it is a Repugnancy that there should be an Extension of Nothing; and therefore, if there be Extension in Space there must be Body. And he proves it from the Idea of Body; for, if we cast off all such things as are not necessary to*

*Body,*

*Body, as Hardness, Colour, Gravity, Heat, and Cold, and all other Qualities, we shall find nothing to remain but Extension, and therefore nothing but Extension is in the Idea of Body, which being likewise in Space the Idea of Body and Space are the same.*

But say you on the other side, *I appeal* Essay, l. 2.  
ch. 13.  
Sect. 12.  
*to every Man's own Thoughts, whether the*

*Idea of Space be not as distinct from that of Solidity, as it is from the Idea of a scarlet Colour. 'Tis true, that Solidity cannot exist without Extension; but this hinders not but they are distinct Ideas.*

*One appeals to Thoughts, and the other to Reason: Had Des Cartes no Thoughts?*

*Yet his Reason convinced him, that whatever Thoughts he had, he must be persuaded by Reason, which was the true Idea. You say, that is a clear and*

*distinct Idea that a Man's thoughts dictate to him to be so. No, saith Des Cartes,*

*that only is the true Idea, which a Man comes to by the Exercise of his Reason;*

*and he look'd upon those others as meer Ideas of Imagination, and not Rational*

*Ideas. So that here we have another Work to do, and that no easie one, which*

*is to distinguish the Ideas of Imagination from those of Reason: and what way*

*have you laid down to prevent so great*  
a Mi-

a Mistake? Or what Rules have you to judge, how far Imagination is to be allowed in the Matter of *Ideas*? For in all Objects of Sense the Impression is made upon the Imagination; which is the Seat of *Ideas*, that come in by Sensation. now here lies a very considerable Difficulty, how far Reason is to judge of these *Ideas* of Imagination? For if all our simple *Ideas* of things without us come in by Sensation, then one would think those *Ideas* are to be allow'd which come in that Way; and so the Impressions of Fancy are to be the Standard and Rule of Certainty, which I think you will not affirm. But what Rule then have you when, and where, and how far, you are to correct the erroneous *Ideas* of *Imagination*?

B. 4. ch. 4.  
Sect. 1.

I cannot deny but you were sensible of the Difficulty from the *Ideas* of *Imagination*, and thus you propose it. To what purpose is all this stir? Knowledge, say you, is only the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of our own *Ideas*, but who knows what those *Ideas* may be? Is there any thing so extravagant as the Imagination of Men's Brains? Where is the Head that hath no Chimæra's in it? Or if there be a sober and wise Man, what disse-

difference will there be by your Rules between his Knowledge, and that of the most extravagant Fancy in the World: They both have their Ideas, and perceive their Agreement and Disagreement one with another. Let us now consider the Answer you give to it, and by that we shall better judge of your Way of Certainty.

Your general Answer is, *that if our Knowledge of our Ideas terminate in our Fancies, our Assurance would go no farther than that of Dreams, or the Visions of a heated Fancy. But our Knowledge is real, only so far, as there is a Conformity between our Ideas, and the Reality of Things.* Sect. 2.

All this is undoubtedly true. But you say, *How shall the mind, when it perceives nothing but its own Ideas, know that they agree with Things themselves?*

There indeed lies the Difficulty, but how do you remove it?

*There are two sorts of Ideas, you say, we may be sure, agree with things.*

And these are worth the knowing.

1. *The first are simple Ideas, which since the mind can by no means make to it self, must necessarily be the Product of Things operating on the Mind in a natural Way.* Sect. 4.

F

and

*and producing therein those Perceptions which by the Wisdom and Will of our Maker they are adapted to. From whence it follows, that simple Ideas are not Fictions of our Minds.*

All that can be proved from hence is no more, but that the Objects of our Senses do make those Impressions upon them, that from them we may be certain there are such things without us, which produce those Impressions. And this is all you mean when you say, that you are certain these Ideas are no Fictions of our Brains. But let us apply this to the present Case. Our Senses truly inform us of a Distance between Bodies; and so far we are certain of an Idea of Space, but the Question about the Idea of Space goes farther; *viz.* Whether the Idea of Space imply something or nothing? How can nothing be extended? If it be something extended it must be Body; and so Space and Body are the same.

And so your *simple Ideas* give no manner of satisfaction in this Matter.

Sect. 5.

2. *All our complex Ideas, except those of Substances, you say, being Archetypes of the Mind's own making, not referr'd to the Existence of any thing, cannot want any Conformity*



formity necessary to real Knowledge ; for that which is not designed to represent any thing but it self, can never be capable of a wrong Representation, nor mislead us from the true Apprehension of any thing by its dislikeness to it.

Where are we now ? What in the Way to Certainty still ? Methinks it seems to be too intricate and winding to be that plain Way. What is meant by these *Archetypes in the Mind* which cannot deceive us ? I confess here are such things said in order to Certainty, which are above my Understanding, if taken with respect to Things ; as how we cannot but be infallibly certain, that all the Knowledge we attain concerning these Ideas is real, and reaches things themselves, and yet they are *Archetypes of the Mind's own making*, not intended to be the Copies of any thing, nor referr'd to the Existence of any thing. How can the Certainty by these Ideas reach the things themselves, if they are *Archetypes of the Mind*, not referr'd to the Existence of any thing ? But I suppose all this is meant of *Mathematical Truths*, and so reaches not the Case, which is concerning the Certainty of our Knowledge of things that really exist.

Sect. 11.

3. You say, *there is another sort of complex Ideas, which being referr'd to Archetypes without us may differ from them, and so our Knowledge about them may come short of being real.* Now these were the things we desired to be made certain in; and to find out such Rules as would make our *Knowledge real.* But for all that I can see, the hopes of any *Criterion* is quite lost, as to the Point in Question: *How shall the mind when it perceives nothing but its own Ideas, know that they agree with the things themselves?*

For upon these Grounds we can have no Certainty as to simple Ideas, but only as to the Power of making Impressions on our Senses; but as to complex Ideas as of Substances, our Knowledge about them may come short of being real, *i. e.* we cannot arrive to Certainty about them in the way of Ideas; because, *they may differ from the Archetypes without us.*

Sect. 12.

And you confess, *that our Ideas are not very exact Copies, and yet are the Subjects of real, (as far as we have any) Knowledge of them; which will not be found to reach very far. But to make it real concerning Substances, the Ideas must be taken from*

from the real Existence of things. And if our complex Ideas may deceive us as to the things from whence they are supposed to be taken, what an Account of *Certainty in the way of Ideas* is here? And yet you conclude this Chapter in that Triumphant manner; *I think I have shewn wherein it is that Certainty, real Certainty consists, which whatever it was to others was to me heretofore one of those Desiderata's, which I found great want of:* And for all that I can see may do so still. For here is nothing said to distinguish the strong Impressions of Fancy from the Appearances of things, from that Certainty of Knowledge which comes from the things themselves. For, a confident Opiniator will talk with greater Assurance of the *Agreement and Disagreement of things with his Ideas*; than a Man of far greater Judgment and more Modesty. And you have given us no Rules to make a difference between *Opinion* and *rational Certainty*; especially when the Ideas of Fancy are found to agree with one another.

But I shall go a step farther to shew, that the *Agreement of Ideas is no Ground of Certainty*, and that from a Suppo-

sition relating to the present Case.

We have seen how possible it is for an ingenious Person skilled in the *Phænomena* of Nature to contrive such an *Hypothesis*, that one Part may agree with another, so as that no discernible Inconsistency may be found in it, and yet all this may be built on such a Foundation, as cannot be consistent with your *Certainty by Ideas*; nay, such as you are certain cannot be true.

The *Hypothesis*, I mean, is that of *Des Cartes*; for allowing him his Laws of Motion, and his three Elements, the *Phænomena of Nature*, or the *Ideas* of it agree with one another, and yet all this is built upon *Space* being the same with *Body*; and consequently, that there can be no *Vacuum*: upon which *his Laws of Motion*, and his Solution of the *Phænomena* is all built. And therefore, when a learned Man of our own objected that to him, and thought it of *no great Consequence to his Philosophy*; he replied with some smartness, that he was mistaken, *for he took it for one of the most certain Principles of his Philosophy*. What *Certainty* then can there be in *Ideas*, when so absurd a Principle as that shall be look'd on by

*Des Cartes*  
Epist. 1.  
Ep. 87, 88.

by so great a Man, as so *certain* a thing in the *Way of Ideas*, as to build his whole System of Natural Philosophy upon it? And his followers to this day stiffly defend it, who are otherwise ingenious Men.

Nothing now remains to be answer'd in your *second Letter*, but what relates to the Defence of what I had said in my Book concerning *Nature* and *Person*. For I cannot but observe, that instead of clearing some pressing Difficulties in my Answer to your former Letter, you run back to my Book, and begin a *new Critique* upon that Part of it; and take in the help of some ingenious Persons of your Acquaintance, to whom I must shew so much Civility as to take notice of their Objections. Which I shall the rather do, because the Doctrine of the Trinity is expressed in the first Article of our Religion by *one Nature* and *three Persons*, and so it hath been understood by the Christian Church long before. And it is the Sense of the Christian Church which I am bound to defend, and no particular Opinions of my own.

You tell me, *that there hath not been* p. 117  
*one of your Acquaintance who owned that*

*he understood my Meaning; but confessed that the farther he look'd into what I had said, the more he was at a loss about Nature and Person. But I hope I am not to answer for other Men's want of Understanding in these Matters: which requires greater Application of Mind, than most Men are willing to allow themselves about them. But I am to judge no otherwise of their Sense and Capacity, than as you have represented them.*

p. 118. *One said I began with giving two significations of the word Nature; One of them, as it stood for Properties; and this he understood; but the other wherein Nature was taken for the thing it self, wherein those Properties were, he said he did not understand. But he said he was not very well acquainted with Greek, and Aristotle was brought to explain and settle the Sense of Nature.*

But why did not this Gentleman in the first Place consider what it was I undertook to shew, which was, that we had an Idea of *Nature*, which came not in by our Senses; and in the very next words I said, " That Nature and Substance are  
" of an equal Extent; and so, that which  
" is the Subject of Powers and Proper-  
" ties

“ ties is the Nature, whether it be meant  
 “ of bodily or spiritual Substances. And  
 “ although by Sensation and Reflection  
 “ we know the Powers and Properties  
 “ of things ; yet it is by Reason we are  
 “ satisfied there must be such a Nature  
 “ or Substance, because it is impossible  
 “ that they should subsist by themselves.

Methinks if the Gentleman were so  
 much at a loss as you represent him,  
 you should have helped him out by your  
*relative Ideas* : For hard things go down  
 much better with some Men's minds in  
 the Way of Ideas, ( which is a sort of  
 gilding the Pills ) and I doubt not but  
 you could have satisfied him, that the  
 Understanding may by virtue of a *rela-*  
*tive Idea* be very well satisfied of the  
 Being of *Nature*, as well as *Substance*,  
 when I declared that I took them to be of  
 equal Extent ; as they were *the Subject*  
*of Powers and Properties*. But he saith,  
*that this he understood not, because Nature*  
*extended to things that were not Substan-*  
*ces*. Did I not say, that *Nature* was some-  
 times taken only for *Properties*, but that  
 there must be another Sense proved, be-  
 cause there must be a Subject wherein  
 these Properties are, and in that respect,  
 I said,

p. 110.

I said, *that Nature and Substance were of equal Extent.* But he doth not understand the Deduction; Aristotle takes Nature for a corporeal Substance, therefore Nature and Substance are of an equal Extent. What a hard Fate doth that Man lie under, that falls into the hands of a severe Critick! He must have a care of his *But*, and *For*, and *Them*, and *It*; For the least Ambiguity in any of these will fill up Pages in an Answer, and make a Book look considerable for the Bulk of it. And what must a Man do, who is to answer to all such Objections about the Use of *Particles*? But let any indifferent Reader judge, how I am used in this Place. My words are "Sometimes Nature is  
 " taken for the Thing it self in which  
 " those Properties are; and so *Aristotle*  
 " took Nature for a Corporeal Substance,  
 " which had the Principles of Motion  
 " in it self; but Nature and Substance  
 " are of an equal Extent. Doth not any Man of Common Sense see, that I oppose this to *Aristotle's* Sense of *Nature* for a *Corporeal Substance*? He confines it to that only; I say, *That it is of equal Extent with Substance whether Bodily or Spiritual:* and those very  
 words



words follow after. If you had really such a Conversation with a *Gentleman*, I am sorry for him; and I think you did not deal so like a *Gentleman* by him, to expose him thus to the World.

But I perceive he is a *Philosopher* too; for he proves, *That Aristotle's Notion of* p. 119. *Nature for a Corporeal Substance will not hold*. Did I ever say that it would? I am far enough from thinking, *that a Corporeal Substance hath a Principle of Motion from it self*; but might not I mention *Aristotle's* taking *Nature* for a *Substance*, although I presently add, his Sense was too short and narrow, because *Nature and Substance* were of equal extent? But did not his *Notion of Nature* imply that it was a *Principle of Motion in it self*? Whatever *Aristotle* thought, the *Notion of Nature* doth not depend upon a *Principle of Motion from it self*; but it was considered, not as *in it self* as the Cause, but *in it self* as the Subject. And that *Philosophical Gentleman* might be pleased to consider, that *Aristotle* did not make *Motion* to arise from Matter, but asserted it to come from a first Mover, and said, *That those Philosophers talked like Men not well in their Wits, who attributed*

*ted Motion to Matter of it self ; as I could easily prove, if it were needful. And methinks you should not have been such a Stranger to Aristotle, to let your Acquaintance run into such Blunders, and then to print them for them.*

But the Gentleman is farther plunged and knows not how to get out. *He cannot for his Life understand Nature to be Substance and Substance to be Nature ? Where lies the Difficulty ? Is the Repugnancy, in the Words, or in the Sense ? Not in the Words or Sense either in Greek or Latin. For the Greek, (if I may have leave to mention that Language in this Case) those who have been very well acquainted with the force of Words therein, have made Nature of the same importance with Substance. So Hesychius renders it by εἶς, Substance ; but I shall not bring the Testimony of Criticks but of Philosophers. And Aristotle may be allowed to understand his own Language, he saith positively, πάντα εἶς φύσις λέγεται ; every Substance is called Nature, and the Reason he gives for it is, ὅτι καὶ ἡ φύσις εἶς τις ὄν, because Nature is a Substance. It may be said, That Aristotle said this, because he took Nature*

Arist. Metaph. l. 5.  
c. 4.

ture for such a Substance as had the Power of Motion in it self; I do not deny, but he look'd on that as the proper Acceptation of *Nature*; but from hence it follows, that whatever Substance had such a Principle of Motion in it self was truly and properly *Nature*; not as exclusive of a Superiour Principle of Motion, but as having an internal self-moving Principle. And herein *Aristotle* differed from some modern Philosophers, who make all Motion to come from the Impulse of another Body, and to be a meer Mode of Matter continued from one Body to another. I confess *Aristotle* was of another Opinion from those Gentlemen, and look'd on Motion as an Effect of an inward Principle; and not meerly of an External Impulse: but whether *Aristotle* were mistaken herein is not the Question; and it is possible he was not; however, it plainly appears, that Substance with a Power of Motion in it self, and *Nature*, had the same Sense; and none of those who have been the most severe Criticks upon *Aristotle* have disputed, that I remember, against this Sense of *Nature* in him. One of them

P. Rami  
Schol. Metaph. l. 5.  
c. 4.

finds this fault, that it was but a Repetition

Phyfic.  
Aufc. 1. 2.  
c. 1.

tition of what he had said in his *Phyſicks*; where he doth likewise treat of the Sense of *Nature*. And there he takes it for such a *Subſtance which hath the Principle of Motion and Reſt within it ſelf and by it ſelf*; which he oppoſes to *artificial things, as a Bed or a Garment*. And as much as this Definition hath been run down by ſome Men, if we ſet aſide ſome affected Obſcurity in his Philoſophical Writings, there is no ſuch Abſurdity in it; when he explains himſelf not to underſtand it of meer *Local Motion*, or change of Place, but of *all Alterations* incident to Bodies. So that *Nature* in his Senſe, was a *Subſtance endued with a Principle of Life and Action*. And all thoſe things which did partake of *Nature* in this Senſe, he ſaid, were *Subſtances*; καὶ ὅτι πάντα πάντα ζοῖα. For *Nature* is always a *Subject and in a Subject*; i. e. the Subſtance it ſelf is *Nature*, and that which is in it is according to *Nature*. And this Senſe of *Ariſtotle Plutarch* relies upon, as the *true Notion of Nature* which he ſaith is *the Principle of Motion and Reſt*; *becauſe the beginning and ending of things depend upon it*: But *Plutarch* by no means approves of thoſe Mens Opinion who

Plut. de  
Plac. Phil.  
l. 1. c. 1.

who made *Nature* to be an Original Self-moving Principle; *For*, saith he, *Matter of it self cannot move without an Efficient Cause, no more than any Metal can frame it self into a particular Form without an Artificer.* From whence we see that *Aristotle's* Notion of *Nature* was very consistent with an Efficient Cause of *Nature*. But your Gentleman saith, *That to those who admit not Matter and Motion to be Eternal, no Nature in that Sense will be left, since Nature is said to be a Corporeal Substance which hath the Principles of Motion in it self, and such a sort of Corporeal Substance those Men have no Notion of at all, and consequently none of Nature, which is such a Corporeal Substance.* But if *Aristotle* did not suppose *Matter* to move it self, without an Efficient Cause, (as certainly he did not) then all this falls to the Ground, and his Notion of *Nature* for a *Substantial Principle of Life and Action* may remain good.

But it may be said, *That this was one of his singular Notions, and that no other Philosophers took it so.* Which is so far from being true, that a great Enemy of *Aristotle's* confesses, *That the Name of Nature among the Writers before him extended*

c. 3.

Letter II.  
p. 119.Fr. Parric.  
Discuss.  
Peripat.  
T. II. l. 2.  
p. 207.

*tended to all kinds of Beings, and not only to Individual but to Specifick Natures.*

*Aristotle's fault lay in applying Nature only to Corporeal Substances; and whatever was above them he look'd on as above Nature; but the Pythagoreans and Platonists took Nature to extend to Spiritual as well as Bodily Substances. Which appears by Timæus Locrus his Book of Nature; in the beginning whereof he divides Things into two kinds, Intellectual and Corporeal; and the former, whose Nature was more excellent, he derives immediately from the best Principle, viz. God himself.*

But to make this plainer, we are to consider, that there were four Opinions, among the Old Philosophers about Nature. Some held Nature to be the same with Matter, and attributed the Beginning of all things to that alone; such were the followers of Anaximander and Democritus. Others rejected this Doctrine as absurd and impious, and held a Divine Being above Matter, which gave the beginning to Motion and framed the World, and they asserted Spiritual as well as Corporeal Natures, and these were  
the

the followers of *Pythagoras* and *Anaxagoras*. Others asserted the Beginning of Motion and of the World from a first Cause; but confined the Sense of *Nature* to the Course of things established in this Visible World by an Universal Providence at first. And this was the Notion of *Aristotle* and his followers to the time of *Strato* who attributed all to meer *Nature*. Lastly, there were some who made *Nature* to be the first Principle which formed all things; which sometimes they called *God*, and sometimes *Nature*, as is obvious in all the Writings of the *Stoicks*; *Vis illud Naturam vocare? non peccabis*; saith *Seneca*: and in another place, *Quid aliud est Natura, quam Deus & divina Ratio?* and again, *Nec Deus sine Naturâ est, nec Natura sine Deo, sed idem est utrumque*, which he elsewhere calls, *Incorporalis Ratio ingenitum operum Artifex*. With which *Balbus* in *Cicero* agrees, when he defines *Nature* from *Zeno*, to be an *Intelligent Fire that produces all things*. For what he calls *Ignem artificiosum ad gignendum*, &c. *Laertius* calls *νοεῖν*

Nat. Quæst.

l. 2. c. 45.

De benef. l. 4.

c. 7, 8.

De Conf. ad

Helv. c. 8.

Cic. de Nat.

l. 2.

*μα τεργασθῆς ἢ τεχνοειδῆς*; and it is called in *Cicero*, *Natura Artifex, Consultrix & Provida, &c.* which can agree to nothing but a *Spiritual Substance*; and when he explains what *Nature* is, he saith, *That Epicurus called all by the Name of Nature*; and divided it into *Matter and Vacuity* and the *Accidents of both*: but we (saith he of the *Stoicks*) by *Nature* understand no *Inanimate Things* which have no *Principle* within to unite them, as *Earth and Stones*; but a *living Substance*, as an *Animal*, in which is no *Chance*, but *Order and Contrivance*. And so *Plato* said, *That Nature ordered all things with Reason and Understanding*. By which he understood the *Divine Being*. If we come lower down among the *Philosophers*, we shall find *Nature* taken for a *Principle of Life*. So *Sextus Empiricus* distinguishes the *Union of Matter* in *Stones and Wood* from that which is in *Plants*, and this he calls *Nature*, which is the lowest degree of it; for afterwards, he speaks of *Rational and Intellectual Natures*, and places *God* in the head of them. *Antoninus* distinguishes

Plato in *Philos.*

*Sext. Empir.*  
l. 8. c. 2.

P. 324.

*Anton. l. 6.*  
sect. 14.



guishes *Nature* in *Plants* from a heap of the Particles of *Matter* in *Wood* and *Stone*. But in another place he l. 10. Sect. 2. distinguishes that which is *meer Nature* in *Man*, viz. what he hath in common with *Plants*, from the *Nature* of an *Animal* in him; and that again from the *Nature* of a *Rational Creature* in him. Here indeed he speaks of the Properties of those *Natures*; but he still supposes, that where they are separate, they are founded in distinct Substances.

So that I hope, if the *Philosophers* of old, of all kinds did understand the Sense of *Nature* and *Substance*, the Gentleman may not continue in such a peremptory Humour of saying, *That for his Life he cannot understand Nature to be Substance, nor Substance to be Nature*. For they all agreed in this, however they differed in their Opinions of *Nature*.

But I have something farther to add concerning the Sense of the *Christian Church* in this Matter; which I think is by no means to be despised.

It is observed by *Damascen*, that *Damasc. Dial. some of the Philosophers made this* c. 32.

G 2                      difference

*difference between εἶς and φύς ; that the former was taken for simple Essence, but the latter for Essence with a Specific Difference ; but that the Christian Writers took both of them for that which was common to more than one, as an Angel, a Man, a Horse, &c.*

Chrysoft.

Hom. 22. in  
Gen.

Theod. in Gen.

Qu. 2.

Basil. in Hex.

Or. 1.

So St. Chrysoftom calls Angels ἀσωμά-  
τους εἶς, and ἀσωμάτους φύς, and

Theodoret ἀσώματος φύς, St. Basil λο-  
γικός ἢ ἀσώματος φύς ; but they all  
agree, that Incorporeal and Invisible  
Substances are real Natures. And the

Reason Damascen gives is, *That they have both the same Original* (and you know that it is a good way to find out the true Idea) for as εἶς is from εἶ, so φύς is from πεφυκέναι, both which are the same. So that if Real Existence belong to Substance, and Nature hath its Name from thence too, then Substance and Nature must be of the same Importance. And this Notion of Nature they do not take up meerly from the Etymology of the Word, but from the Sense of it in Scripture ; as when St. Paul saith, *They worshipped those which by Nature are no Gods ;* τοῖς φύσιν μὴ ὄντι θεοῖς,

Gal. 4. 8.

Stoics, as the *Alexandrian Copy* hath it more clearly; *i. e.* which are not really and substantially Gods. They had the Names of Gods, and the Divine Properties were attributed to them; but because they had not the Divine Essence, they are said not to be *Gods by Nature*. And what Sense would this Gentleman make of the Apostle's words, *who cannot for his Life understand that Nature is the same with Substance*? He must understand this only of the Properties which belong to God. But these Properties must be somewhere, and so a Substance must be supposed as the Subject of them; and what Reason can there be to exclude that which is the Subject of those Properties? For there must be a *Divine Being*, as well as Properties; and that Being must have Essential Properties belonging to it; and what imaginable Reason can there be, why that should not be called the *Divine Nature*? And if it be, then *Substance* and *Nature* are the same. I might easily pursue this farther, but I design to bring things into as little a compass as I can.

Mr. Boyle of  
the Notion of  
Nature, p. 27.

But it may be there is something in our own Language which hinders *Nature from being taken for a Substance*; and for this I appeal to a late Ingenious and Honourable Person and Philosopher of our own; I mean Mr. Boyle, who hath written a Philosophical Enquiry into *the Notion of Nature*; and he tells us of the various Acceptations of it. (1.) For the Author of Nature. (2.) For the Essence of a Thing. (3.) For what comes to Men by Birth; as a Man is Noble by Nature. (4.) For an Internal Principle of Motion: as that a Stone is carried downwards by Nature. (5.) For the established course of things; as that Nature makes the Night to succeed the Day. (6.) For an Aggregate of Powers belonging to a Living Body; as that Nature is strong or weak. (7.) For the System of the Universe; as when we say of a Chimæra, there is no such thing in Nature. (8.) For a Semi-Deity; which is the Notion he opposes. But we may observe, that he allows *God and all the real Beings of the Universe* to have *Nature* belonging

ing to them ; and he saith, *The Word* P. 35.  
*Essence is of great Affinity to it, if not*  
*of an adequate Import.* But the Real  
 Essence of a thing is a Substance ; and  
 therefore Nature and Substance are of  
 the like Importance.

The next thing fit to be considered  
 is, How far your *Certainty by Ideas*  
 and *the Certainty by Reason* differ from  
 each other.

The occasion of this Debate stands  
 thus.

I had said in my Book, " That I Discourse of  
 " granted, that by Sensation and Re- the Trinity,  
 " flection we come to know the Pow- p. 25.  
 " ers and Properties of things ; but  
 " our Reason is satisfied, that there  
 " must be something beyond these,  
 " because it is impossible that they  
 " should subsist by themselves. So  
 " that the Nature of things properly  
 " belongs to our Reason and not to  
 " meer Ideas.

In answer to this you said, *That you*  
*can find no Opposition between Ideas*  
*and Reason ; but Ideas are the Objects*  
*of the Understanding, and Understan-*  
*ding is one of the Faculties employed*  
*about them.*

To which I replied, " No doubt  
 " of it. But you might easily see,  
 " that by Reason I understood Prin-  
 " ciples of Reason, allow'd by Man-  
 " kind ; which I think are very dif-  
 " ferent from Ideas. But I perceive  
 " Reason in this Sense is a thing you  
 " have no Idea of, or one as obscure  
 " as that of Substance.

If there be any thing which seems too sharp and reflecting in the Manner of Expression, I do not go about to defend it ; but the worst of it is, That your Idea of Reason is as obscure as that of Substance. And whether there were not a just Occasion for it, the Reader must judge when the *Faculty* was put for the *Principles of Reason*. Could any Man judge otherwise, but that you had a *very obscure Idea of Reason*, who could mistake the *Understanding* for it ?

P. 124.

But Reason, you say, taken for the *Faculty* is as different from Ideas in your Apprehension. But what is that to the Point in Dispute, whether the Notion of Nature be to be taken from Ideas or from Reason ? You say, the *Understanding* is imploy'd about them.

*them.* And what then? I shewed that the Nature of things belongs to *Reason* and not to *bare Ideas*; because *Ideas* come in by Sensation and Reflection; by which we come to know the Powers and Properties of things; but we cannot come to know the Notion of *Nature* as the Subject of them, but by this Reason that we are convinced they cannot subsist of themselves. And is this no more than to say, *the Understanding is employed about Ideas*? But now you answer farther, *That if Reason be taken for the Faculty or the Principles of Reason allowed by Mankind, Reason and Ideas may consist together.* This leads me to the Examination of that which may be of some use, viz. To shew the Difference of your Method of *Certainty by Ideas*, and the Method of *Certainty by Reason.*

And the Way of *Certainty by Reason* lies in two things;

1. *The Certainty of Principles.*
2. *The Certainty of Deductions.*

As to the former, the Gentleman your Defender in your Book saith, *That in your Essay, in more places than*

*one*

*Ibid.*

*one, you have spoken, and that pretty largely of Self-evident Propositions and Maxims ; so that if I have ever read them, I cannot doubt, but you have Ideas of those common Principles of Reason.*

Book 4 ch. 7.  
Sect. 10.

What *I*deas you have of them must appear from your Book. And I do there find a Chapter of *Self-evident Propositions and Maxims* ; which I cannot but think extraordinary for the Design of it ; which is thus summed up in the Conclusion, *viz.* That it was to shew, *That these Maxims, as they are of little use where we have clear and distinct Ideas, so they are of dangerous use, where our Ideas are not clear and distinct.* And is not this a fair way to convince me that your *Way of Ideas* is very consistent with the *Certainty of Reason* ; when the *Way of Reason* hath been always supposed to proceed upon *General Principles* ; and you assert them to be *Useless and Dangerous*.

Sect. 4.

Your first Design you say is to prove, that the Consideration of these *General Maxims* can add nothing to the *Evidence or Certainty of Knowledge* ; which



which overthrows all that which hath been accounted *Science* and *Demonstration*, and must lay the Foundation of *Scepticism*. Because our true Grounds of Certainty depend upon some *general Principle of Reason*. To make this plain, I shall put a Case grounded upon your Words, which are, *that you have discoursed with very rational Men, who have actually denied that they are Men*. These Words, J. S. understands as spoken of *themselves*, and charges them with very ill Consequences; but I think they are capable of another meaning: However, let us put the Case that Men did in earnest question, whether they were Men or not; and then I do not see, if you set aside general Maxims, how you can convince them that they are Men. For, the way I look on as most apt to prevail upon such extraordinary Sceptical Men, is by general *Maxims* and *Principles of Reason*. As in the first place, that *Nothing can have no Properties*; which I take to be the Fundamental Principle of Certainty, as to real Beings. For, all our inward Perceptions are only of some Acts or

Pro-

Book 4. ch. 7.  
Sect. 17.

Solid Philos.  
asserted Preface, Sect. 16.  
Reflex. 19.  
p. 378.

Properties, as of *Thinking, Doubting, Reasoning, &c.* and if a Man proceeds so far as to question every thing, in order to the discovering the true Ground of Certainty, he cannot be satisfied with finding out only some Modes of Being; but that which he aims at is, satisfaction as to his real Existence.

But this wholly depends upon the Truth and Certainty of this *Fundamental Maxim; That Nothing can have no Operations*; and therefore, whatever thinks, or doubts, or reasons, must certainly be. And since by another Fundamental Maxim, *it is impossible for the same Thing to be and not to be*; he cannot entertain any possible doubt of his own Existence.

It may be said, *that this reaches only to bare Existence, and not to the Being Men.* I answer, that for the Certainty as to that, there are other general Maxims of necessary Use; As, *That all different sorts of Beings are distinguished by Essential Properties; That the Essential Properties of a Man are to Reason, Discourse, &c. That these Properties cannot subsist by themselves without*

*without a real Substance: And therefore, where these Properties are found, those who have them must be real and substantial Men.*

You may possibly say, *that these* Book 4. ch. 9.  
Sect. 3.  
*Maxims are useless, because you affirm that nothing can be more evident to us, than our own Existence; and that we have an internal infallible Perception that we are.*

But I answer, that these Maxims do not at all appear to be useless, because the Certainty we enquire after is a Certainty of Reason, and not of bare Perception. And if it be a Certainty of Reason, some Ground of Reason must be assigned for it: but all that the Perception reaches to, are those Acts mention'd by you. *I think, I reason, I feel pleasure and pain:* but the Question goes farther as to the Subject of those Acts, and the Nature of that Subject, whether it be a Man or not.

Now here lies the main Difficulty, whether without the help of these Principles you can prove to any that doubt, that they are Men? And I shall now shew, that in your Way of *Ideas* you cannot. For,

(1) You

(1) You suppose that we must have a clear and distinct Idea of that which we are certain of in the Way of Ideas.

(2) You deny that we have any such clear and distinct Idea of Man.

Book 4. ch. 7. Sect. 4. 1. You suppose, that we must have a clear and distinct Idea of that we are certain of. For in your Chapter of *Maxims*, you say, *that every one knows the Ideas that he has, and that distinctly and unconfusedly one from another. Which always being so (I pray mark that, and judge whether you do not make clear and distinct Ideas necessary to Certainty) he can never be in doubt when any Idea is in his mind, that it is there, and is that Idea it is, and that two distinct Ideas when they are in his mind are there, and are not one and the same Idea*: From whence you infer *the Necessity of Certainty, when the Ideas are clear and distinct*. This is so plain and clear, that I wonder how you came to forget it, and to think that I did you wrong when I charged you with holding *clear and distinct Ideas* necessary to Certainty. But of that in the Beginning of this Discourse.

2. But

2. But let us now examine your *Idea of Man*, whether that be clear and distinct or not ; and if not, then according to your Principles *very rational Men* cannot be certain that they are Men. For if they have no Way of Certainty but by *Ideas*, and you allow no *clear and distinct Idea of Man*, then they can come to no Certainty ; and I hope you will not deny them to be *very rational Men*, if they follow the *Way of Ideas*.

First, you shew, that there can be no *Demonstration in the Way of Principles* what Man is. Book 4. ch. 7.  
Sect. 16.

Secondly, that there are very different *Ideas of Man*, some, you say, make the *Idea of a Man without a Soul* ; as Children do. Others add *Laughter and rational Discourse*, and these may demonstrate by general Principles that *Ideots and Infants* are no Men by this Maxim, that it is impossible for the same thing to be, and not to be ; and you have discoursed with *very rational Men*, who have actually denied that they are Men. Sect. 17.

Others take in the *Idea of Body in general*, and the Powers of *Language and Reason*, and leave out *shape* ; and

*So a Man may be a Four-footed Creature, or in whatever Body or Shape he found Speech and Reason joined, that was a Man.*

But where is the *clear and distinct Idea of a Man* all this while? We can have *no Certainty by Principles*, you say, and you offer none in *the Way of Ideas*; for the *Ideas* are very confused, imperfect and repugnant to each other; and so in this new Method of Certainty by *Ideas*, we cannot be so much as certain *that we are Men*.

But is it possible to suppose, that a *rational Man* should talk of Certainty by *Ideas*, and not be able to fix the *Idea of a Man*? One would have thought this had been only an *Omission* in this place out of pure Zeal *against Principles*; but certainly in other places *this Idea of a Man* must be made *clear and distinct*. So far from it, that in other places, you industriously set your self to disprove the *common Idea of a Man*. *It could not possibly be*, say you, *that the abstract Idea to which the Name Man is given, should be different in several Men, if it were of Natures making; and that to one it should be animal rationale; to another animal im-*

Book 3. ch. 6.  
Sect. 26.

implume bipes latis unguibus. From whence it is plain, that you allow no clear and distinct Idea of Man; and you endeavour to expose *the sacred Definition*, as you call it, of *animal rationale*; which was never exposed by any Man without Cause. But you conclude, *That we are far from know-* Sect. 17:  
*ing certainly what Man is ; - though perhaps it will be judged great Ignorance to doubt about it. And yet you think you may say, That the certain Boundaries of that Species are so far from being determined, and the precise Number of simple Ideas, which make that nominal Essence so far from being settled and perfectly known, that very material Doubts may still arise about it. So that I begin to think J. S. was in the right, when he made you say, That you had discoursed with very rational Men who denied themselves to be Men. But this is a little too hard to deny themselves to be Men. If it had been only, who doubted whether they were Men or not ; you could not deny them to be very rational Men, because they went upon your Grounds, that we can have no Certainty either by Principles, or*  
H by

by any *clear and distinct Ideas*, what a *Man is*.

Thus I have shew'd how inconsistent your way of *Ideas* is with true *Certainty*; and of what Use and Necessity these *general Principles of Reason* are.

I now come to the *Certainty of Reason in making Deductions*. And here I shall briefly lay down the *Grounds of Certainty*, which the Ancient Philosophers went upon, and then compare your way of *Ideas* with them.

*Aristot. Metaph. l. 5.*

*Aristotle* observes, that *Socrates* first brought in *Definitions* and *Inductions* in order to *Certainty*; and went no farther. *Plato* allowed no *Certainty*, but only *Opinion*, as to External Objects; but he said; that *Certainty* depended upon abstract and separate *Ideas*, which were always the same. This

Answer to the first Lett. p 32.

he took, (as I observed in my former Letter) from the *Pythagoreans*, only changing *Numbers* into *Ideas*. For by *Numbers*, they understood first *Principles*, not gross and material; but *immaterial* and *eternal*, as *Jamblichus* saith; and therefore *Moderatus Gadi-tanus*, one of the most understanding Men

*Jambl. in Nicom. p. 5.*



Men among them saith, *the Pythagoreans brought in Numbers*, *Ἐσθήμους διδασκαλίας χρεῖν*, *for a more decent Way of Instruction, following the Practice of Geometricians, who make use of Figures to represent things to the Mind*; and therefore their *Doctrine of Numbers* was the *Philosophy of Principles*, or the general Grounds of Certainty; but this was so abstruse and so little understood, that it soon lost its Reputation, as *Porphry* observes, or was mixed with *Platonism*; and therefore *Photinus* joins the *Pythagorean* and *Platonick Principles* together. But *Aristotle* was a great Enemy to these abstracted Speculations, and therefore set himself so much on all occasions against *Ideas* and *Numbers*, especially in his *Metaphysics*. But instead thereof, he endeavour'd to bring down Certainty to material Things, and to real Beings. In order to this, he saw it necessary to avoid Confusion, by explaining doubtful Terms, and by ranking things under several Heads, which he called *Categories*; wherein all things are reduced to *Substance*, and *Accidents* belonging to them; to

*Porph. vit.*  
*Pythag.*

*Metaphys. l. 7.*  
*c. 15, 16. l. 12.*  
*c. 4, 5.*

which he joins some general Discourses about *the right Apprehension* of things *simply consider'd*. But it is observable, that in all the *Categories* from *Archytas the Pythagorean* downwards, (who first placed them in that Order,) *Substance* was first ranked, as the most proper *Idea* of the Mind, and all *Accidents* or *Modes* were consider'd with respect to that. And the French *Cartesians* in their *Logick*, place *Substance* as the *first Object* of their *Ideas*: and do not leave us a *relative Idea*, to be supposed only, because *Accidents* cannot subsist without a *Subject*. Then follows the Way of understanding *the Truth and Falshood of Propositions*; after which, he pursues the Way of *Reasoning*, or inferring one thing from another, which he calls *Syllogizing*, wherein he professes to go upon this *common Principle of Reason*, *That what things do agree in a third must agree among themselves*. But being not content with the ordinary *Dialectical Way*, which proceeded upon the *Concessions* of the Party, he attempted to bring in *true Demonstration*. To which he  
supposes

supposes *general Axioms* necessary, and *Definitions*, and *Postulata* : and he distinguishes between a *necessary Conclusion*, and a *Demonstration* ; for the former may arise from the manner of reasoning ; but a *Demonstration* supposes a *necessary Cause*, and that the Propositions are such as that the Conclusion necessarily follows from them. So that *Demonstration* according to him must be of an inseparable Property, and by the most immediate and necessary Cause. How far *Aristotle's* Notion of *Demonstration* can be applied to Physical matters is not my business to enquire ; it being only to shew what his Method of Certainty was.

But besides *Aristotle*, the *Stoicks* took upon them to lay down the true Method of Certainty ; and they went another Way to work about it, *viz.* (1.) By finding out the *Criterion* of Truth and Fallhood. (2.) By examining the Consequences and Deductions of Reason.

As to things which had some Degree of Evidence to Sense or Reason, they made the *Criterion* necessary,

but for those which had not, but must be proved, the Examination of that Proof was necessary in order to Certainty.

The *Criterion* was agreed to be μέτρον κατανύξεως, the Measure whereby we are to judge of things. But as in the Use of Balances for Weight, there must be one to hold them, and the Balances themselves, and the Position of them; and as in the judging of a Line, whether straight or crooked, there must be the Artificer, the Rule and the Application of it; so in judging of Truth and Falshood, there must be the Faculty of Understanding as the Artificer, Sense and Reason as the Rule; and the inward Ideas of the Mind, which answer'd to the Position of the Balances, or the Application of the Rule. Now that which they placed their Notion of *Certainty* in, was that *inward and comprehensive Idea*, which was called by them ἡ κατανυκτικὴ φαντασία. If it were a weak Assent, they called it *Opinion*; for they made the Assent voluntary, notwithstanding the *Criterion*; but if it were a *firm and immoveable*

able Assent, that they called *Knowledge* and *Certainty*.

But besides these *comprehensive Ideas*, as they did allow of *common Notions*, which they called *περλήσεις*, or *Anticipations*: of which *Arrian* speaks; and *Simplicius* saith, they are those wherein all are agreed, and are planted in us by right Reason, and confirmed by Time and Observation.

*Arrian*. l. 1.  
c. 22. l. 3. c. 26.  
*Simplic.* in E-  
pic. c. 33.

As to the other Part, they took great pains about the true signification of Words, the rank and order of Things, the nature and kind of Propositions, and the difference of Signs, whereof some were *Monitory*, and others *Demonstrative*. And the proving a thing uncertain, by something granted to be certain, was that which they called *Demonstration*. According to the Principles of the *Eleatick School*, the most simple and natural Way of reasoning was supposed to be by drawing *Consequences* upon *Suppositions*, and the Way the *Stoicks* took to judge of reasoning, was by judging what approached nearest to the *first Principles* of reasoning; such as that every thing we talk about either must be or not be; and in such

disjunct Propositions, one Part or other must be taken, and then a Train of Consequences follows.

Plut. de Ei-  
Delph. Sim-  
plic. in Epist.  
c. 58.

And *Plutarch*, no friend to the *Stoicks*, thinks this faculty of drawing Consequences, lays the best Foundation for *Demonstration*. For the Principle of it, he saith, is the τὸ συννημένον, *the connex Way of reasoning*; that is as *Simplicius* explains it, *when two things are so joyned together as antecedent and consequent, that by Position of the Antecedent, the Consequent follows, and by taking away the Consequent, the Antecedent is removed*. Thus I have, in a few Words, as I could, laid together those old Methods of Certainty, which have obtained greatest Reputation in the World.

But your Way of Certainty by *Ideas* is so wholly New, that here we have no general Principles; no Criterion, no Antecedents and Consequents; no Syllogistical Methods of Demonstration; and yet we are told of a better Way of Certainty to be attained, meerly by the help of *Ideas*. But how comes there to be such a Way of Certainty by *Ideas*, and yet the *Ideas* themselves  
are

are so *uncertain* and obscure? I confess, that the more I look into it, the farther it appears to be from a *Way of Certainty* to me. For in your Chapter of the *Improvement of Knowledge*,  
 Essay, B. 4.  
 ch. 12. Sect. 14.  
 you have these Words; *for it being evident that our Knowledge cannot exceed our Ideas, where they are imperfect, confused or obscure, we cannot expect to have certain, perfect, or clear Knowledge.* And yet how often do you confess, that our Ideas are *imperfect, confused, and obscure*? How then is it possible to attain to any *Certainty* by them? And notwithstanding these plain Words, you assert it over and over in your second Letter, as appears in the Beginning, *that you do not place Certainty in clear and distinct Ideas, (as I observed in the Beginning.)* How can these things consist? Can *Certainty* be had with *imperfect and obscure Ideas*, and yet *no Certainty be had by them*? I cannot blame you for finding fault with *common Principles of Reason*, if both Parts of a *Contradiction* may be true: But I forbear. However I cannot but join other Words of yours to shew how resolved

Book 4. ch. 2.  
Sect. 15.

solved you were to be inconsistent with your self : *But obscure and confused Ideas can never produce any clear or distinct Knowledge ; because as far as any Ideas are confused or obscure, so far the Mind can never perceive clearly, whether they agree or disagree.*

And yet in the same Place, you say, *that our Knowledge consisting in the Perception of the Agreement or Disagreement of any two Ideas, its clearness or obscurity consists in the Clearness or Obscurity of that Perception, and not in the Clearness or Obscurity of the Ideas themselves.* How is it possible for us to have a *clear Perception of the Agreement of Ideas*, if the Ideas themselves be not clear and distinct ?

If the Mind can never perceive clearly, the Agreement or Disagreement of obscure and confused Ideas, how can its Knowledge lie in the Perception of that which is not to be perceived ?

This is a thing which I cannot make consistent.

But besides, I have another Charge upon your Way of Certainty, viz. that you have no *Criterion* to distinguish false and doubtfull Ideas from

true



*true and certain*; how then can any Man be secure that he is not imposed upon in this Way of *Ideas*?

The *Academicks* went too far in the Way to *Scepticism*, but they differ'd from the *Scepticks* in two Things.

1. They asserted, that there was no absolute Certainty to be had, which the *Scepticks* would not. 2. They held a far greater Probability in some things than others, and that Men were bound to follow the greatest Probability in what concern'd their own Welfare: but the *Scepticks* said, that they would do as others did, or follow Inclination, and the Laws of their Country, but they held no *Opinion* in their Minds, as they said.

The *Academicks* went much upon *Ideas*, or Representations of things to their Minds, but they did not proceed upon every *Idea*, but they examin'd and weigh'd all the Circumstances belonging to it, before they allow'd it to prevail upon them to give an Assent as to a greater Probability. *Carneades*, one of the subtlest of them, as appears by *Sextus Empiricus*, distinguished a three-fold *Idea*.

Sext. Empiric.  
advers. Ma-  
them. l. 7.

I. Πιστις

1. Πιθανὴ φαντασία *a probable Idea*; which the *Academicks* called Ἐμφασις. For, said he, neither that which appears false of it self; nor that which is true, but doth not appear so, can perswade a Man's Mind. And of those things which do appear to be true, some have a very slender Appearance, others have a mighty strong one, and therein he placed his *Criterion*.

2. Ἀπεκρίπτος φαντασία, *an undistracted Idea*; i. e. when no Circumstances disturb or shake the first Impression, so as to make us question the Truth of it; which *Sextus Empiricus* calls συνδρομὴ φαντασιῶν, *a Concurrence of Ideas* and none disagreeing, and yet he would not allow this to be a Ground of certainty but only of *Probability*.

3. Διεξιδομένη φαντασία, *a well examined Idea*, by the best Reason a Man hath and the greatest Application of Mind. And this was the Foundation of the highest *Probability* a Man's Mind could reach to. Now to apply this to your Case; You tell us of a *Way of Certainty by Ideas*, and never

ver offer any such Method for Examining them, as the *Academicks* required for their *Probability*. As for instance, Your first Idea which you go upon, is that of *Solidity*, which, Essay, B. 2. ch. 4. you say, of all others seems the most intimately connected with and essential to *Body*: And therefore must be of great Moment. *Solidity*, you say, Seet. 5. consists in *Repletion* and *Resistance*; and by this Idea of *Solidity* the *Extension* of *Body*, you say, is distinguished from that of *Space*; so that of pure *Space* and *Solidity* you have clear and distinct Ideas. Now here in the Way of Certainty I have two Questions to ask. 1. How this *Idea* comes to be clear and distinct to you, when others who go in the same Way of Ideas have quite another *Idea* of it, and think they have as plain and distinct an *Idea* that the *Extension* of *Space* and *Body* are the same? Now, what *Criterion* is there to come to any Certainty in this Matter? I see none so much as offer'd, but only that they seem to you to be clear and distinct, but to others the contrary. So that here we are at a loss as to any

ny Certainty in the Way of *Ideas*. And the blind Man who fancied the *Idea* of Scarlet to be like the sound of a Trumpet, could hardly be convinced of his Error in the Way of *Ideas*. This you mention to shew the *different Ideas* men may fall into; which I think is enough to shew that they have no Way of Certainty in themselves, if it be possible for Men, even for Philosophical and Rational Men, to fall into such contrary *Ideas* about the same thing; and both sides think their *Ideas* clear and distinct. 2. But I have another Question to propose; viz. Whether by this *Idea* of Solidity we may come to know *what it is*? This is a very reasonable Question in the *Way of Certainty*, which is to lead us to the certain knowledge of Things. I pray therefore tell me from your *Idea*, *what it is*, and *wherein it consists*? The Question you suppose might be very well asked; and you give a most satisfactory Answer to it. *If any ask me what this Solidity is, I send him to his Senses to inform him.* I had thought by the Design of your Book you would have sent him to his *Ideas*

*Ideas for Certainty*; and are we sent back again from our *Ideas* to our *Senses*? What do these *Ideas* signifie then? But you say farther; *That if this be not a sufficient Explication of Solidity, you promise to tell him what it is, when he tells you, what Thinking is, or explains to you what Extension and Motion are.* Are we not now in the true Way to Certainty; when such things as these are given over, of which we have the clearest Evidence by *Sensation* and *Reflection*? For here you make it as impossible to come to certain, clear and distinct Notions of these things, *as to discourse into a blind Man the Ideas of Light and Colours.* Is not this a rare way of Certainty?

Thus I have shewed that you have no Security against *false* and *uncertain Ideas*, no *Criterion* to judge them by; no Light into the Nature of Things by them, as will farther appear by what you say of the *Ideas of sensible Qualities.* To discover, say you, *the Nature of our Ideas the better, and to discourse of them intelligibly, it will be convenient to distinguish them*

Book II. ch. 8.  
Sect. 7.

*them, as they are Ideas or Perceptions in our Minds ; and as they are Modifications of Matter in the Bodies that cause such Perceptions in us : that so we may not think ( as perhaps is usually done ) that they are exactly the Images and Resemblances of something inherent in the Subject : most of those of Sensation being in the Mind no more the likeness of something existing without us, than the Names that stand for them are the likeness of our Ideas, which yet upon hearing they are apt to excite in us. Now here again our Ideas deceive us, in the Way of Certainty. We desire to know something of the Nature of those Objects of which we have the Ideas in our Minds, because these we are told, will bring us to a Certainty of Knowledge. Of what ? Of what we feel : No certainly, but of that which causes these inward Perceptions. Can we then by these Ideas know the Nature of things without us ? No, you say we cannot ; for most of those of Sensation are no more the likeness of something without us, than Names are for things which they stand for. So that these*

these *Ideas* are really nothing but Names, if they be not *Representations* of *Things*; and if they be not, how can we understand *Things* by them; and if we cannot, what *Certainty* is attainable by them?

But I will do you no wrong; and therefore I must consider what you say about *Demonstration*: For it cannot be denied that you own the thing, although you deny it to be *ex præcognitis* & *præconcessis*, and say, it is B. IV. ch. 2. Sect. 8. a mistake that they are supposed to be the Foundations of all our Knowledge and Reasonings. We must therefore Examine your Way of *Demonstration* without *Principles*.

*Certainty*, you say, depends so wholly Sect. 12. on *Intuition*, that in *Demonstrative Knowledge*, this *Intuition* is necessary in all the *Connexion* of the *Intermediate Ideas*, without which we cannot attain Knowledge or *Certainty*. By *Intuition* you mean *Self-Evidence*. For you say, in this the *Mind* is at no pains of proving or examining, but perceives the *Truth* as the *Eye* doth *Light* only by being directed towards it. For hence you must suppose *Self-Evidence*

to be in the *Ideas* of your Mind; and that every *Intermediate Idea* which you take to demonstrate any thing by, must have a Self-Evident Connexion with the other *Idea*: which is such a way of Demonstration, as the old Philosophers never thought of. For upon this Ground every Demonstration carries its own Light with it; and can no more be questioned, than whether two and two make four; and I would be glad to see any *Demonstration* (not about Figures and Numbers) of this kind, which I think is not to be expected in the Way of Ideas. But because in this lies the chief Point as to a *Way of Certainty* by *Ideas*, I shall more carefully examine the Grounds you proceed upon, and shew them to be very Insufficient for the purpose you intend them.

Your principal Ground is from *Mathematical Demonstrations*, and your Examples are brought from them. But his is quite a different Case from yours. For you grant, that those *Ideas* on which *Mathematical Demonstrations* proceed, are wholly in the Mind,



Mind, and do not relate to the Existence of Things; but our Debate goes upon a *Certainty* of the *Knowledge of Things* as really existing; so that, although we should grant all that you say, about the *Intuition of Ideas in Mathematical Demonstrations*, yet it comes not at all to your Business, unless you can prove that we have as *clear and distinct Ideas* of *Beings*, as we have of *Numbers* and *Figures*. And yet herein you are not consistent with your self; for you design to prove *Demonstrations* without *General Principles*; and yet every one knows, that *General Principles* are supposed in *Mathematicks*, and that Person would be thought Ridiculous, who should go about to prove, that *General Principles* are of *little, or of dangerous use* in *Mathematical Demonstrations*. And so in *Morality*, which you place among the *Sciences capable of Demonstration*; you confess, *That the Way of Demon-* B. IV. ch. 3.  
*stration therein is from Principles, as* Sect. 18.  
*those of the Mathematicks, by necessary Consequences.* This is a very intelligible Way of *Demonstration*: But how then comes it to pass, that in the

- Ch. 7. Sect. 10. *Way of Certainty by Ideas as to other Points of Knowledge, you deny general Maxims to be the Foundation we are to proceed upon? And the Method*
- Sect. 9. *you lay down, is this, that Ideas of particular things are first in the mind, which are first received and distinguished, and so Knowledge got by them;*
- Sect. 10. *but general Ideas are Fictions and Contrivances of the Mind, which carry Difficulty with them; but that it is true of our particular distinct Ideas, that they are all known by their Native evidence, are wholly independent, receive no Light, nor are capable of Proof one from another; much less the more particular from the more general, or the more simple from the more compounded, the more simple and less Abstract being the most familiar, and the easier and earlier apprehended. But which ever be the clearest Ideas, the Evidence and Certainty of all such Propositions is in this, that a Man sees the same Idea to be the same Idea, and infallibly perceives two different Ideas to be two different Ideas. For when a Man has in his Understanding the Ideas of One and of Two, the Idea of Yellow and of Blue, he cannot  
but*

*but certainly know, that this Idea of One is the Idea of One, and not the Idea of Two; and that the Idea of Tellow is the Idea of Tellow, and not of Blue. For a Man cannot confound the Ideas in his Mind, which he has distinct; that would be to have them confused and distinct at the same time, which is a Contradiction: and to have none distinct is to have no use of our Faculties, to have no knowledge at all. And therefore, what Idea soever is affirmed of it self; or whatsoever two entire distinct Ideas are denied one of another, the Mind cannot but assent to such a Proposition, as infallibly true, assoon as it understands the Terms without Hesitation, or need of Proof, or regarding those made in more general Terms, and called Maxims. These are your own Words, which I have set down at large, that you may not complain that I misrepresent your Sense. And if I understand the force of them, you take off the Way of Demonstration from general Principles and Consequences deduced from them, and place it in the Self-evidence of Ideas.*

But that it is impossible to come to a *Demonstration* about real Beings, in this Way of *Intuition of Ideas*, I shall now make appear from your self, which will farther discover the Inconsistency of your *Notion of Ideas*.

And the Reasons I go upon are these ;

1. That you confess, that some of the most obvious Ideas are far from being *Self-evident*.

2. That there may be contradictory Opinions about some Ideas, which you account most *clear and distinct*.

3. That granting the *Ideas* to be true, there is no *Self-evidence* of the *Connexion* of them, which is necessary to make a *Demonstration*.

1. That some of the most *obvious Ideas*, are far from being *Self-evident* by your own Confession. Among these you cannot deny those of *Matter* and *Motion*, of *Time* and *Duration*, and of *Light*, to be very considerable. But I shall prove from your self, that we can have no *Intuition* of these things, which are so obvious to us; and consequently can have no *Self-evident Ideas* of them.

As

As to the *Idea* of *Matter* : That you tell us, *consists in a solid Substance every where the same ; and a Body is a solid extended figured Substance.*

Book 3. ch. 10.  
Sect. 15.

Now there are two things concerning *Matter*, which I would be glad to come to a certain Knowledge of. And those are,

1. The Manner of Cohesion of the Parts of Matter, concerning which you have these Words. *For since no Body is no farther, nor otherwise extended, than by the Union and Cohesion of its solid Parts, we shall very ill comprehend the Extension of Body, without understanding, wherein consists the Union and Cohesion of its Parts, which seems to me as incomprehensible as the Manner of Thinking, and how it is performed. I would have any one intelligibly explain to me, how the Parts of Gold or Brass (that but now in fusion were as loose from one another, as the Particles of Water, or the Sands of an Hour-glass) come in a few Moments to be so united, and adhere so strongly one to another, that the utmost force of Men's Arms cannot separate them. A considering Man will I suppose be here at a loss, to*

Book 2. ch. 23.  
Sect. 24.

Sect. 25.

*satisfie his own or another Man's Understanding.* And can you then imagine that we have *Intuition* into the *Idea* of *Matter*? Or that it is possible to come to a *Demonstration* about it by the help of any *intervening Idea*? The *Idea* of *Solidity*, or firm Cohesion of Parts cannot be said to come from the *Idea* of *Matter* it self, for then there could be no such thing as *fluid Matter*. Whence then comes the distinction between these *Ideas* of solid and fluid *Matter*? That there is such a Cohesion of the solid Parts of *Matter* is evident: now what other *Ideas* do you compare and connect with this to make it evident, how this *Solidity* and *Matter* came to have this Agreement with each other?

Is it by the *Density* or *Compactedness* of the *Matter* in a little Compass? But that is as hard to give an account of; *viz.* how some Parts of *Matter* come to take up so much less Room, and to stick closer than others. Is it by bare *Rest* of the Parts? But how comes the *Resistance* of solid Bodies to come only from *Rest*? Is it from the *Pressure of the Ambient Air*? No you say,

say, that in Truth the Pressure of an ambient Fluid how great soever, can be no intelligible Cause of the Cohesion of the solid Parts of Matter. So that we are not to look for any thing like a Demonstration of the Cohesion of the Parts of Matter. Book 2. ch. 23: Sect. 24

2. And as little are we to expect it, as to the *Divisibility* of it; which was the other thing I hoped to find demonstrated in the Way of Ideas. For you tell us, that the Notion of Body is cumbered with some Difficulties which are very hard, and perhaps impossible to be explained, or understood by us. Ch. 23. Sect. 31 And among these you particularly instance in the *Divisibility* of Matter; which you say, whether we grant or deny it to be in infinitum, it involves us in Consequences, impossible to be explicated or made consistent. Consequences that carry greater Difficulty, and more apparent Absurdity than any thing can follow from the Notion of an immaterial knowing Substance. So that I think it is vain to expect a Demonstration in the Way of Ideas as to this Matter.

The next is that of *Motion*. Concerning which you tell us, that the  
Defi-

Book 3. ch. 4. *Definition of the Schools is exquisite Jargon: That of the Atomists is but putting one Synonymous Word for another; viz. that Motion is a Passage from one Place to another: for Passage may as well be defined a Motion from one Place to another. And the Cartesian Definition, that it is the successive Application of the Parts of the Superficies of one Body to those of another, will not prove a much better Definition of Motion when well examin'd. And what is there so evident as Motion? So that if our Ideas fail us in so plain a Case, what help can we hope from them in things more abstruse and remote from our Senses?*

Book 2. ch. 14. *that the Answer of a great Man ( to one who asked what Time was, Si non rogas, intelligo, which amounts to this, the more I set my self to consider it, the less I understand it ) might perhaps persuade one, that Time, which reveals all other things, is it self not to be discover'd. This shews, that there is no Self-evident Idea of Time. But here you offer to furnish us with as clear and distinct Ideas, as of many other which*  
are



are thought much less obscure. However, then it is plain, that we have not the Knowledge by *Intuition*, but by rational Deduction. For you proceed from the *Idea of Succession*, to that of *Duration*; by observing a Distance in the Parts of *Succession*; and then from observing *Periodical Motions*, we get *Ideas of the Measures of Duration*, as *Minutes, Hours, Days, Tears, &c.* From hence we proceed to imagine *Duration* not yet come; and such to which we can always add; from which comes the *Idea of Eternity*: and by considering any Part of *Duration* with *Periodical Measures*, we come to the *Idea of what we call Time* in general. So that the *Idea of Time* in general is so far from being known by *Intuition*, that many Steps are to be taken in order to it; and some such as one would hardly have thought of. As how the *Idea of Succession* should arise from a *Train of Ideas* in our *Minds*: You say it is, because we have no Perception of *Duration*, but by considering the *Train of Ideas*, that take their Turns in our *Understandings*.

Sect. 32.

Sect. 4.

What think you of those People that fail'd not in reckoning the Succession

cession of Time right for many Years together by Knots, and Notches on Sticks, and Figures, without ever so much as thinking of *Ideas*, or any thing like them? But besides, such Arbitrary Measures of Time, what need any Recourse to *Ideas*, when the Returns of Days and Months and Years by the *Planetary Motions*, are so easie and so universal? If a Man hath no Perception of Duration when he *sleeps*, yet the Time runs on, and Nights have as much their share in Succession as Days have. And although, you say, *it seems very clear to you, that Men derive their Ideas of Duration from their Reflection on the Train of the Ideas they observe to succeed one another*, yet I think the contrary so clear, that Men may have a *clear Idea of Succession* without it, that I rather wonder how you came to think of this Way. But it is sufficient to my purpose, that you could never know this *Idea* of Time by *Self-evidence*.

The last I shall mention is *Light*, and one would think, if any *Idea* be *Self-evident*, it should be that. But  
let

let us see what you say about it; you explode the *Peripatetick Definition* of it as unintelligible; and the *Cartesian* you allow to be but little better. For when they make it to be a Number of little Globules striking briskly on the bottom of the Eye, you say, to a Man that understands it not before, these Words would make the Idea of Light no more known to him, than if one should tell him, that Light was nothing but a Company of little Tennis-balls, which Fairies all day long strook with Rackets against some Men's Foreheads while they pass by others. And is this a Self-evident Idea of Light? Thus we have seen what Account your self have given of these *Self-evident Ideas*, which are the ground Work of *Demonstration*.

Book 3. ch. 4  
Sect. 10.

2. But suppose an *Idea* happen to be thought by some to be *clear and distinct*, and others should think the contrary to be so, what hopes of *Demonstration* by *clear and distinct Ideas* then? As suppose a Man entertain *Des Cartes* his *Idea of Space*, as the same with Body, or extended Matter, which he affirms to be *clear and distinct*; the  
Con-

Book 4. ch. 7.  
Sect. 12.

Consequence from hence is, as your self confess, *that he may from thence demonstrate that there can be no Vacuum* : but again, let us suppose another to have a clear and distinct Idea of Space from Body, *this Man*, you say, *may demonstrate as easily that there may be a Vacuum, or Space without a Body, as Des Cartes demonstrated the Contrary.* Say you so? What! *Demonstrations* on both sides, and in the *Way of Ideas* too? This is extraordinary indeed. But if we may be allow'd the Use of common Principles, we may be sure, that both Parts of a Contradiction cannot be true, and therefore there must be a fundamental Mistake some-where. You say, *it is in wrong Application of that general Maxim, What is, is.* But there is no fault in the Principle, which is the true meaning of the other; that *it is impossible for the same thing to be and not to be*, which undoubtedly holds true; but it is in supposing the Reality of the thing to be according to what you call a *clear and distinct Idea*. So that the general Principles of Reason stand firm and good; but your  
Self-

*Self-evidence of clear and distinct Ideas* is such a Principle, we see, as serves for *Demonstrations* of both Parts of a Contradiction.

3. But granting the *Ideas* to be true, yet when their *Connexion* is not *Self-evident*, then an *intermediate Idea* must complete the *Demonstration*. But how doth it appear that this *middle Idea* is *Self-evidently connected* with them? For you say, *if that intermediate Idea be not known by Intuition, that must need a Proof*; and so there can be no *Demonstration*. Which I am very apt to believe in this Way of *Ideas*; unless these *Ideas* get more light by being put between two others. This will best appear by a remarkable Instance already mention'd, *viz.* in the *Ideas of Space and Body*; the Question supposed is, whether they be the same or not; some we see affirm it, and others deny it. So that here we must use an *intermediate Idea*, and that is of *Motion*, and we are to consider whether this hath a *Self-evident Connexion*, with the other *Ideas*? *The Motion of Bodies*, you say, *that are in our view and neighbour-*

Book 4. ch. 2.  
Sect. 7.

Essay, B. 2. ch.  
13. Sect. 22.

*hood, seems to you plainly to evince a Vacuum. But how? Is it by Intuition or Self-evidence? No, you do not pretend to it. But by Reason: Because there must be a void Space equal to the Bulk of that Body, which moves within the Bounds of such a Superficies. And if there be a Space without Body there must be a Vacuum. But Gassendus attempted to prove Motion impossible, if there were no Vacuum: For every Body must go into the Place of another, and so in infinitum; which he said was ridiculous and impossible.*

*The Cartesians answer'd, that the Motion was Circular. Gassendus urged, that still it was impossible: For suppose A the first Body, and X the last; A cannot move, unless X can be moved: but X cannot move, because the Place is filled with A.*

*The Cartesians say, this proves nothing, because in the same instant, that X goes into the Place of A, that gives way. Joh. Bapt. Morinus (Professor of the Mathematicks at Paris, at the same time with Gassendus) answers to Gassendus his Argument, that the*

Joh. Bapt. Morini Dissert. de Atomis & vacuo, p. 14.

*the Separation of two Bodies and Succession are at the same time ; and so there can be no Vacuum.*

Bernier defends Gassendus his Argument, and saith, *that no Motion can begin without a Vacuum* ; but other Philosophers and Mathematicians as stiffly deny it. And is it possible to imagine, that there should be a Self-evident Connexion of *Ideas* in this Case ?

Bernier Favila  
la Ridiculi  
Muris, p 99.

But what hath Reason now to do in this *Way of Intuition* ? Yes, say you, Reason is to discover the Agreement or Disagreement of *Ideas*. But this is nothing but an imploying the Faculty of Reason in such a manner: And so in the Beginning of your Chapter of Reason, you tell us, *that it is sometimes taken for true and clear Principles, and sometimes for clear and fair Deductions from those Principles; but you take it for a faculty in Man.* But why, in a Chapter of Reason, are the other two Senses neglected? We might have expected here full Satisfaction as to the Principles of Reason as distinct from the faculty, but you wholly avoid it; and only shew how it is used in finding out the certain Connexion of *Ideas*

Sect. 1.

Ch. 17. Sect. 1.

Sect. 2.

*in Demonstration; and the probable Connexion in other things.* So that the Difference lies between us, as to this Matter of *Reason*, in these two things.

(1.) You affirm, *that general Principles and Maxims of Reason are of little, or no Use*; I say that they are of very great use, and the only proper Foundations of Certainty.

(2.) You say, *that Demonstration is by Way of Intuition of Ideas, and that Reason is only the faculty employ'd in discovering and comparing Ideas with themselves, or with others intervening; and that this is the only Way of Certainty.*

I affirm, and have proved, that there can be no Demonstration by *Intuition of Ideas*; but that all the Certainty we can attain to, is from *general Principles of Reason*, and *necessary Deductions* made from them.

But before I conclude this Discourse, I must observe that you prove that *Demonstration* must be by *Intuition*, in an extraordinary Manner, from the sense of the Word. For you say, *it is called Demonstration, it being shewn to the Understanding, and the Mind made see, that it is so.* I have told  
you



you formerly, how very uncertain a Way of Arguing it is, which is taken from the Original signification of Words; and if it would hold in this Case, it would be most proper for *Ocular Demonstrations*, or by the Finger. But in the Philosophical sense of the Word, *Demonstration* was never taken for *Intuition*, or the knowing of a thing by its Self-evidence. But you assert *the Necessity of intuitive Knowledge, in every Step of a Demonstration.* Sect. 7, 8.

Whereas, *Aristotle* saith, *things that are Self-evident cannot be demonstrated; and that it is Weakness and Folly not to know what things are capable of Demonstration, and what not.* *Aristot. Metaph. l. 4. c. 4.*

It seems there were some Philosophers, who would have first Principles demonstrated; *This, saith Aristotle cannot be done without running in infinitum, which is absurd.* Whence it is plain, that *Demonstration* was supposed to lie in some antecedent Proof; and where any thing was *Self-evident* it was absurd to look for it: So that the Way of *Intuition* and *Demonstration*, were thought inconsistent. For what a Man sees by its own Light, he

- needs no Proof of. But you say, *that*  
 Sect. 3. *in a Demonstration the intervenient Ideas*  
*are called Proofs ; and where by the help*  
*of these the Agreement or Disagreement*  
 Sect. 7. *is plainly perceived, that is Demonstra-*  
*tion : And that in every step there is an*  
*intuitive Knowledge of the Agreement or*  
*Disagreement it seeks with the next in-*  
*termediate Idea, which it uses as a*  
*Proof ; for, if it were not so, that would*  
*need a Proof.* So that according to  
 your Method of *Demonstration*, that  
 which is used as a *Proof* must *need no*  
*Proof*, but must be known by *imme-*  
*diate Intuition.* Of which kind of De-  
 monstration, I would fain see any one  
 instance in the Knowledge of Things,  
 and not in abstracted and mathemati-  
 cal Demonstrations. For it may be,  
 it hath been the occasion of some  
 great Mistakes in the Philosophy of  
 this Age, that ingenious and mathe-  
 matical Men have labour'd so much  
 to accommodate the Principles of that  
 Science to the Nature of material  
 Things ; of which we have a remark-  
 able Instance in the System of *Des*  
*Cartes.* And supposing we could come  
 to a Certainty about the Nature and  
 Ten-

Tendency of Bodies here within our Reach, ( I mean with respect to the Earth ) I do not know, how far the greatest Mathematician can proceed in making Demonstrations as to the Nature and Tendency of those Bodies which are so much out of our Reach, as the Heavenly Bodies are, both in themselves and with respect to one another. For, if the *Phænomena* depend upon a force given them by the Great and Wise Creator, how can we know in what Manner or Degree that force is given to Bodies at such a wonderfull Distance from us, as the fixed Stars are ? For, if God can alter the Laws of Motion in *another System*, as it is not denied; how can we be Mathematically certain, that the Laws of Motion in Bodies, so much above us, are the very same that we find them here ? I do not by any means take off from the laudable Endeavours of those who have gone about to reduce natural Speculations to mathematical Certainty: but I mention it to shew, that it is a very easie way for thinking Men to deceive themselves, in talking so much of

*Arist. de Part.  
Anim. L. 1. c. 1.*

*De Gen. A-  
nim. L. 3. c. 10.*

*demonstrative Certainty* about natural Things, when all their Instances are brought from *Mathematical Demonstrations*. *Aristotle*, whom I cannot despise so much as some do ( I do not say for want of reading him ) hath a Discourse on purpose in the Beginning of his *Books of Animals*, in what way natural Things are to be handled ; and he saith, *there are two ways*. 1. *By way of Science*. 2. *By way of Instruction*, which must be suitable to the Nature of the things. So that in natural History he saith, *there must be certain bounds set for Enquiry, without proceeding to strict Demonstration*. And, saith he, *the Manner of Demonstration as to natural Things, is different from what it is in speculative or mathematical Things*. In another Place he laments the want of *Experiments as to natural History*, ( although he made far more than any before him, and was better able to do it by the plentiful Assistance of *Philip* and *Alexander*, while he lived at Court ) and he looks on that *as the best way of satisfying our Reason about such things ; and our Reasons*, saith he, *are then good, when they agree with the Phenomena*.

And

And he was so far from thinking he had made *Demonstrations in Physics*, that in one Place he saith, *that in things not evident to Sense, he thought it sufficient to shew the Possibility of it*; and therefore he ought not to be run down for his Modesty; however his physical Notions fall far short of *Demonstrations*.

De Meteor.  
l. 1. c. 7.

In his *Morals*, he saith, *all Principles must be suitable to the Nature of the Science*; for it would be absurd for a Man to go about to prove the three Angles of a Triangle, equal to two right Angles; and take this for his Principle, *That the Soul is immortal*. For the Proof must be proper and connected with it. And from hence he excludes Plato's Idea, from being a Principle in *Morals*.

Moral. Magn.  
l. 1. c. 1.

In his *Eudemia*, the Way of Proceeding in *Morals*, he saith, *is by Reasons, Testimonies, and Examples*; and he looks on it as great want of Judgment for Men not to consider what Reasons are proper for every Science. So that according to him, *Morality* is not incapable of Demonstration; so it be upon *Moral Principles*: For that he lays

Eudem. l. 1.  
c. 6.

Ethic ad Ni-  
com 4.1. c. 1, 7.  
1. 2. c. 2.

down in the Beginning of his *Ethicks*, and afterwards *that the same Exactness is not to be required in all sorts of Reasoning: but that it ought to be suitable to the Matter it is about.* Ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὕλην οἱ λόγοι ἀπαιτῆται.

If therefore the *Principles* in *Morality* be clear and proper, and the *Deductions* be plain and natural, I do not see, but that it is as capable of *Demonstration* as any other Science; if Men were as willing to be convinced in *Morals*, as they are in *Mathematicks*. And therein I fully agree with you: But the *Way of Demonstration by Ideas* will not do, either there or any where else. I mean by this *intuitive Knowledge in every Step of the Demonstration*: when the *intervening Ideas* are far from being capable of this *intuitive Certainty*.

And as to your Argument from the Notation of the Word, it is certain, that after the Philosophical Use of it, it signified no more among some Philosophers, than *the Conclusion of an Argument*; whereby we are brought from *something we did perceive, to something we did not*.

Not

Not by Way of *Intuition*, but by a  
*Deduction of Reason*. And Plato makes  
 use of the Word *Demonstration* in his  
*Phædrus*, for *such a Reason which wise*  
*Men would believe, and others would*  
*not*. But there could be no intuitive  
 Certainty in such a Demonstration.

Itaque Ar-  
 gumenti Con-  
 clusio quæ est  
 Græcè Ἀπό-  
 δεξις ita de-  
 finitur; Ratio  
 quæ ex rebus  
 perceptis ad id  
 quod non per-

cipiebatur adducit. Cicero in Lucullo, c. 8.

Ἡ δὲ δὴ Ἀπόδεξις ἐστὶν δεισις μὴ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποιοῦς δὲ πρὸς, Plato  
 in Phædro. V. Dial. Ciceron. Adam Bursii, l. 6. c. 10.

I have been longer a clearing this  
 Matter than I thought I should have  
 been; but it is the main Point as to  
*Certainty by Ideas*, and what remains  
 will admit of an easier Dispatch. I  
 now return to the Difference between  
*Nature and Person*; and I shall only  
 single out what is material and perti-  
 nent; and now leave the interlocu-  
 tory Gentlemen to maintain their  
 Conversation by themselves.

I had said in my Vindication, " That  
 " Nature may be consider'd two Ways.  
 " (1.) As it is in distinct Individuals.  
 " (2.) Abstractly without respect to  
 " individual Persons.

(1.) " As it is in distinct Individu-  
 " als, as the Nature of a Man is equal-  
 " ly

“ ly in *Peter, James and John*, and this  
 “ is the common Nature with a par-  
 “ ticular Subsistence belonging to each  
 “ of them. For the Nature of Man,  
 “ as in *Peter*, is distinct from the same  
 “ Nature, as it is in *James and John* ;  
 “ otherwise they would be but one  
 “ Person, as well as have the same Na-  
 “ ture. Which to my understanding  
 is plain and clear Reason. And if so,  
 then here we have an *Identity of Na-*  
*ture*, and a *Distinction of Persons* in the  
 same Nature.

But to this you object these three  
 Things:

P. 127.

(1.) *That you cannot put together  
 one and the same, and distinct ; and con-*  
*sequently there is no Foundation for the*  
*Distinction of Nature and Person.*

P. 131, 132.

134. 138, &c.

(2.) *That what I say about common  
 Nature, and particular Subsistence and*  
*Individuals, is wholly unintelligible to*  
*you and your Friends.*

P. 154.

(3.) *That to speak truly and precise-*  
*ly of this Matter, as in reality it is,*  
*there is no such thing as one common Na-*  
*ture in several Individuals ; for all that*  
*is Truth in them is particular, and can*  
*be nothing but particular. But the*  
*meaning*



*meaning is, that every particular individual Man or Horse, &c. has such a Nature or Constitution as agrees, and is conformable to that Idea which that general Name stands for.*

This is the Substance of what I can gather out of your Discourse in several Pages, but as to the general Reflections I pass them over, having no other Design, but to set Truth in as good a Light as I can. And if I have the Misfortune not to be understood, I cannot help it; I wish it were in my Power to help other Men's Capacities as well as to help my own.

But you say, the *Notionists and Idealists*, ( as they are called ) seem to *have their apprehensive Faculties very differently turned?* I do not think, that there is any *different Turn in their Faculties*; but there may be a very wrong *Turn* in the Method of Reasoning in those, who go in this *Way of Ideas*, from what there is in those who pursue the general *Principles of Reason*, and from thence draw particular Conclusions.

If any Man takes it for granted, that your *Way of Ideas is the only Way to Certainty*

*Certainty* (and he must take it for granted, if he will believe it) then I cannot see how he can apprehend *one and the same common Nature* in different Persons or Individuals, because all his *Ideas* are taken from *Particulars*; and therefore a common Nature is no more but *one common Name*; and every Individual is consider'd as ranked under those Names. But herein lies the fundamental Mistake, that you presume that we are not to judge of things by the *general Principles* of Reason, but by *particular Ideas*. For if Men set aside this new Way of Judging only by these *Ideas*; things would appear in another Light to them: But I find it is to very little purpose to argue with such Men, who are resolved to *stick to this Way of Ideas*; For they can apprehend nothing but just in their own Way. And let us say what we will, it is *jargon*, and *unintelligible* to them; although *very rational Men* have said the same things that we do, and have been thought by the rest of Mankind to have spoken *intelligibly*. But now it seems nothing is *intelligible*, but what suits

suits with this *new Way of Ideas*, however repugnant it be to the common Principles of Reason ; which must be the Standard to Mankind, whatever becomes of this Way of Ideas.

And therefore in this Debate, I shall proceed upon these *Principles of Reason*, which have been receiv'd among Mankind ; and from them I hope to make it appear, that the Difference of *Nature* and *Person* is not imaginary and fictitious, but grounded upon the real Nature of things.

The *Principles of Reason*, which I go upon are these ;

1. That Nothing hath no Properties.
2. That all Properties being only Modes or Accidents must have a real Subject to subsist in.
3. That Properties essentially different, must subsist in different Essences.
4. That where there is an Agreement in essential Properties and a Difference in Individual, there must be both an Identity and Diversity in several Respects.

Now

Now upon these *Principles* I build my Assertion, that there is one real and common Nature or Essence in Mankind, and a Difference of Persons in the several Individuals. For, that there are such essential Properties in Mankind which are not in Brutes, I suppose you will not deny. Now these essential Properties must subsist somewhere; For Nothing can have no Properties, and these Properties cannot subsist ( where Individuals are multiplied ) in any one Individual: For that is to exclude all the rest from the essential Properties which belong to them; and if they have them in common, there must be some common Subject wherein they subsist, and that can be nothing but the common Essence of Mankind. For the Essence of Brutes or Plants have them not; and therefore these Essences must be really different from one another.

But because Individuals of the same kind, have something to distinguish, as well as to unite them, therefore there must be a different Subsistence in every Individual: and so *one and the same*, and yet *distinct*, may very easily

easily and intelligibly consist together.

But you say, *I have not told you what Nature is*; I think my Discourse sufficiently shew'd it, if you had a mind to understand it; for you could not but see that I meant the Subject of the essential Properties, whether you call it *Nature, Substance, or Essence*. Your Objection about *Nature and Substance being of equal Extent*, I hope, I have sufficiently removed in the foregoing Discourse.

P. 131.

You tell me, *that it is more than you know, that the Nature of a Man is equal in Peter, James and John*. I am sorry for it. For I thought you had *Ideas of particular Substances*. But they may be *Drills or Horses for any thing you know*. I am again sorry, that you know particular Men no better; but that for ought you know, they may be *Drills or Horses*.

P. 132.

But you know a *Horse that was called Peter*, and you do not know but the *Master of the same Team might call other of his Horses, James and John*. Suppose all this. And could you not in the *Way of Ideas* distinguish them from those

P. 133.

those of your Acquaintance who had the same Names? I confess, this tempts me to think that *Ideists* ( as you call them ) have a particular *Turn of their understandings* about these Matters. For I cannot but think, that those who were not *very rational Men*, might understand the Difference between *Men* and *Horses*; without being told, that although Horses might be called by their *Names*; yet that these were real Men, and *their Constitution and Nature was conformable to that Idea, which the general Name Man stands for.* But this is no more than to say, that he that has the Nature of a Man is a Man, or what has the Nature of a Drill is a Drill; and what has the Nature of a Horse is a Horse; whether it be called Peter, or not called Peter. If this were really the Discourse of your Friends in private Conversation, you have been very obliging to them to publish it to the World: For Mankind are not so stupid, as not to know a Man from a Horse or a Drill, but only by the *Specifick Name of Man.* You may have a Horse called Peter if you please, and another James, and  
a third

a third *John*; but for all that, there is no one that hath the Understanding of a Man, but will be able without your *Specifick Names* to tell the Difference of your *Horse Peter* from your *Man Peter*; and call them by what Names you please the Difference will not depend upon them, but upon the Essential Properties which belong to them; and so it will be owned by all that have not this *New turn of their Understandings*. But I plainly see, that a new Notion when it hath got deep into a Man's Head doth give a strange *Turn* to his Understanding; so that he cannot see that, which every one else can, that hath not the same Tincture upon his Mind. And I remember an Observation of yours, B. II. ch. 11. Sect. 13.  
*How dangerous it is to a Man's Reason to fix his Fancylong upon one sort of Thoughts.* These *Ideas* are a very odd sort of *Spectacles* to our Understandings, if they make them see and understand less, than People of very ordinary Capacities do. For even the Man who had the *Horse with the Name Peter*, and might have others by the Names of *James and John*, would not a little wonder at a grave Philosopher that should seriously say to  
L him;

him; You see, Friend, that your Horses have the Names of *Men*, how do you know but that they are Men? *Know*, saith the Country-man, I hope you are wiser than to ask me such a Question? Or what do you take me for, if I cannot tell the Difference of Men from Horses whatever Names they have. Do not tell me of your *Specifick Names*, and *Conformity to your Ideas*, I know well enough the Difference between my *Horse Peter* and my *Man Peter* without such Gibberish. My *Man Peter* and I can sit and chop Logick together, about our Country Affairs, and he can Write and Read, and he is a very sharp Fellow at a Bargain; but my *Horse Peter* can do none of these things, and I never could find any thing like *Reason* in him, and do you think I do not know the Difference between a *Man* and a *Beast*? I pursue this no farther lest the Country-man should be too rude to the Gentlemen, with whom you had this *Learned Conversation*, about the Difference of *Men*, and *Horses*, and *Drills*.

But you or your Friend, or both, are  
 p. 114. very hard set again *about a Common Na-  
 ture*



*ture with a particular Subsistence proper to each Person. For such is your Misfortune, you say, that for your Life you cannot* p. 121.  
*find it out. This is a hard Case; before, for your Life you could not understand Nature and Substance to be the same; and now again, for your Life you cannot find out this. Where lies the monstrous Difficulty of it? You say, You repeated, and this twenty times to your self; and your weak Understanding always Revolts. At what? My Words are, "Nature may be considered, as it is in "distinct Individuals, as the Nature of "Man is equally in Peter, James and "John. And this is the common Nature with a particular Subsistence proper to each of them.*

*You say, That the Nature of Man in* p. 135.  
*Peter is the Nature of a Man, if Peter be supposed to be a Man, but if it be the Name of a Horse, your Knowledge vanishes. Cannot you, for your Life, know the Difference between a Man and a Horse, by their Essential Properties, whatever their Names be? If so, there is a greater turn of Mens Understandings, than I imagined. But again say you, Let it be impossible to give that Name to*

*a Horse (who ever said or thought so?) yet you cannot understand these Words, the common Nature of a Man is in Peter; for whatsoever is in Peter exists in Peter; and whatever exists in Peter is particular; but the common Nature of Man is the general Nature of Man, or else you understand not what is meant by Common Nature; and it confounds your Understanding to make a General a Particular.*

To this I answer, That the Common Nature of Man may be taken two ways. *In the way of Ideas, and in the way of Reason.* In your way of Ideas it is not at all to be wondered at, that you cannot understand such a Common Nature, as I spake of, which subsists in several Persons, because you say, *You can have no Ideas of Real Substances but such as are Particular; all others are only Abstract Ideas, and made only by the Act of the Mind.* But I say, That in the *Way of Reason* you may come to a better understanding of this Matter. Which is by considering the Nature of Beings, and the Causes of the Differences amongst the several kinds of them. I had told you before, in my Answer to your first Letter, that we are to consider

Beings

Beings as God hath ordered them in their several Sorts and Ranks, and that he hath distinguished them by Essential Properties from each other, as appears by Mankind, and Brutes, and Plants: And that although the Individuals of the several kinds agree in Essential Properties, yet there is a real Difference between them in several Accidents that belong to them, as to Time, Place, Qualities, Relations, &c. Now that wherein they agree *is the Common Nature*; and that wherein they differ, is the *Particular Subsistence*. And if this be so hard to be understood, why was it not answered here in the proper place for it? is not that a Real Nature that is the Subject of Real Properties? Is not that Nature really in all those who have the same Essential Properties? And therefore the *Common Nature* of Man must *exist in Peter*, because he is a Man, and so in *James* and *John*: and yet every one of these is so distinguished from the other, that we may justly say he hath a *Particular Subsistence* with that *Common Nature*. And this is *no making a General a Particular*; but distinguishing one from the other, which is a Di-

stinction so easie and necessary, that I cannot but wonder at those who say, that *for their Lives* they cannot find it out.

I had said, "For the Nature of Man as in *Peter*, is distinct from that same Nature, as it is in *James* and *John*, otherwise they would be but One Person as well as One Nature. And what

p. 137. Reply is made to this? *You cannot understand what this is a Proof of.* It is plain that I meant it of a *Particular Subsistence*; and if you cannot for *your Life* understand such easie things, how can I for *my Life* help it? Read the Words over again which are before them, and join them together. "And this is the Common Nature with a Particular Subsistence proper to each of them; for the Nature of Man as in *Peter* is distinct from that same Nature as it is in *James* and *John*. But I am really ashamed to be put to explain such things; I hope *Ideas* do not give another Turn to

p. 138. Common Sense. But you say, *That otherwise they could not be three Persons, is to prove it by a Proposition unintelligible to you, because you do not yet apprehend what a Person is.* Of that in its proper

proper place. These Words of mine follow, " And this Distinction of Persons in them, is discerned both by our Senses as to their different Accidents, and by our Reason because they have a separate Existence, not coming into it at once and in the same manner. And is this *unintelligible* too? You say, *It will hold as well for three Physical Atoms, which are three distinct Individuals, and have three distinct Natures in them, as certainly as three distinct Men.* But are *three Atoms* as much *three Persons* as *three Men*? But you cannot discern the distinction by our Senses as to their Accidents, nor by your Reason as to separate Existence, because God might create them at once. Therefore we cannot distinguish *three Humane Persons* that way? Is this Reasoning in the *Way of Ideas*? Or in any Way?

*Suppose we put the Common Nature of an Animal for the Common Nature of Man.* What follows? *Therefore three Animals are three distinct Persons, as well as three Men?* I thought there was some cause for your Disliking the *Common Principles and Methods of Reasoning.* I am forced to give but short touches at

such things, which I cannot answer more largely, without being thought to *make Marks of Distinction.*

Come we now therefore to the Second Sense of Nature, “ as it is taken abstract-  
 “ ly without Respect to Individual Per-  
 “ sons ; and then I said, it makes an  
 “ entire Notion of it self. For how-  
 “ ever the same Nature may be in dif-  
 “ ferent Individuals, yet the Nature in  
 “ it self remains one and the same ;  
 “ which appears from this evident Rea-  
 “ son, that otherwise every Individual  
 “ must make a different kind.

Is this to be understood any better ?

No. *An entire Notion of it self is an*  
 p. 144. *Expression never met with before. An*  
*entire Idea of it self* had been very plain  
 and easie ; but this is not to talk with  
 Men in their own Dialect. *But if we*  
*put it so, the Difficulty remains.* What  
 Difficulty ? *It then makes no more an en-*  
*tire Notion than the Nature of Peter.*  
 Is it not the same Nature considered as  
*common* to all Individuals, distinct from  
 that *Nature as in Peter* ? I wish among  
 all the Ways of enlarging Knowledge,  
 you could think of some new Way of  
 conveying Notions into Mens Minds,  
 for

for I find your *Way of Ideas* will never do it. For you cannot be brought one step beyond the first Cast of *Ideas*. And you will not allow, that which I give for an Evident Reason, *to prove* P. 146.  
*any thing towards clear Apprehensions of one Common Nature.* But if *Nature* be one and the same in different Individuals, then there must be one Common Nature, which makes an entire Notion of it self: If it be not one and the same, then every Individual must make a Distinct Kind? Can any thing be more evident? But you give one common Answer; *I understand not* P. 147.  
*any thing that is meant in this whole Paragraph, as to the right Apprehension of one Common Nature.* And so I am very well content to leave it to the Reader's Understanding.

And now I come at last to the *Idea of a Person*. And here I am glad to find *something you do understand*: Which is great News. *This, say you, I understand* P. 149.  
*very well, that supposing Peter, James and John to be all three Men, and Man being a Name for one Kind of Animals, they are all of the same Kind.* Do you mean that they have the same common Essence,  
 or

or have only the same common Name? If you mean the former, there must be a common Nature; if only the latter, that cannot make them of the *same Kind*. For *Kind* signifies nothing but a meer Name without it. If it be asked you, whether *Men* and *Drills* be of the same Kind or not? Could you give no other Answer, but that the *Specifick Name Man* stands for one sort, and the *Specifick Name Drill* for the other; and therefore they are not of the same Kind? Are those Names arbitrary, or are they founded on real and distinct Properties? If they be arbitrary, they have no other Difference, but what a Dictionary gives them. If they are founded on real and distinct Properties, then there must be a real Difference of Kinds founded in Nature; which is as much as I desire. But to go on. *You understand too very well, that Peter is not James, and James is not John, but that there is a Difference in these Individuals. You understand also, that they may be distinguished from each other by our Senses, as to different Features and Distance of Place, &c. But what follows, you say, You do not understand, viz. that supposing there were no such external*



*ternal Difference, yet there is a Difference between them as Individuals of the same Nature. For all that this comes to, as far as you can understand, is that the Ground of the Distinction between several Individuals in the same common Nature is that they are several Individuals in the same common Nature. You understand, it seems, that they are several Individuals, that Peter is not James, and James is not John; and the Question is, what this Distinction is founded upon? Whether upon our observing the Difference of Features, Distance of Place, &c. or on some antecedent Ground? I affirm, that there is a Ground of the Distinction of Individuals antecedent to such accidental Differences as are liable to our Observation by our Senses.*

P. 152.

And the Ground I go upon is this, that the true Reason of Identity in Man is the vital Union of Soul and Body: And since every Man hath a different Soul united to different Particles of Matter, there must be a real Distinction between them, without any respect to what is accidental to them. For, if *Peter* have a Soul and Body different from *James*, and *James* from *John*, they must have

have different *Principles* of *Individuation*, without any respect to Features or Place, &c.

P. 149.

You say, *You cannot suppose a Contradiction, viz. that there is no difference of Place between them.* But that is not the Point, whether when we consider them with respect to Place, there can be such a thing as Identity of Place to two different Bodies? But whether we cannot consider two several Individuals of Mankind without particular Regard to Place? Which I say, we may, and for this Reason; because Relation to Place, is an external Difference, but the real Distinction of Individuals doth not relate to any Accident of the Body; because the Individual consists of the Union of Soul and Body; and you cannot judge of the Existence of the Soul by the Place of the Body. You say, *that when we see any thing to be in any place in any instant of Time, we are sure (be it what it will) that it is that very thing, and not another which at that Time exists in another Place, how like and undistinguishing soever it may be in all other Respects. And in this consists Identity.* But I think the Identity of Man depends  
neither

Essay, B. 2.  
ch. 27.  
Sect. 1.

neither upon the Notion of Place for his Body ; nor upon the Soul consider'd by it self, but upon both these, as actually united and making one Person. Which to me seems so clear and intelligible, that I can imagine no Objection against it. I am certain, you produce none.

My next Words are, “ And here lies  
 “ the true Idea of a Person, which arises  
 “ from that Manner of Subsistence, which  
 “ is in one Individual, and is not com-  
 “ municable to another.

In your Answer to this, I pass over the trifling Exceptions, about *the Dissyl-* P. 155.  
*lable Person*, and *the true Idea and Sig-*  
*nification of the articulate Sound*; and about *here* and *herein*, &c. being resolved to keep to what appears material. And the only thing of that kind is, *that ac-* P. 156.  
*cording to my Sense of Person, it will as*  
*well agree to Bucephalus as to Alexan-*  
*der ; and the Difference will be as great,*  
*between Bucephalus and Podargus, as*  
*between Alexander and Hector, all being*  
*several Individuals in the same common*  
*Nature : but for your Part you cannot un-*  
*derstand that Bucephalus and Podargus*  
*are Persons in the true signification of the*  
*Word*

*Word Person in the English Tongue.* And whoever desired you should? For I expressly say, that a Person is a compleat intelligent Substance, with a peculiar Manner of Subsistence. And again, For a Person relates to something which doth distinguish it from another intelligent Substance in the same Nature. So that it is impossible to apply my Notion of Person to any irrational Creatures, although they be *Bucephalus* and *Podargus*: And I think a Man must strain hard to make such Objections, so directly against that Idea of a Person which I set down. And it is very easie to understand the Difference between a Distinction of *Individuals* as such, and of *intelligent Individuals*, and that Manner of Subsistence in them, which makes them distinct Persons.

P. 159.

But you say, that I affirm, that an individual intelligent Substance is rather supposed to the making of a Person, than the proper Definition of it; and yet afterwards I make it to be the Definition of a Person, that it is a compleat intelligent Substance.

To this I answer, That in the former Place I give an Account of the Reason  
of

of *Personality*, which I say lies in the Manner of Subsistence, and not in the intelligent individual Substance; which is rather supposed to the making of a Person: For that which critically distinguishes the Person is the Reason of Personality; but when we come to give a common Definition of it, there is no such Necessity of insisting upon the Reason of the Difference, but upon the common Acception of it *Person*. And upon that Account I call it a *complete intelligent Substance*, because, although the *Soul* be so in it self; yet we take *Person* with Relation to *Soul* and *Body* united together. And so the *Identity* of *Person* must take in both, not only here, but at the Resurrection.

And thus I have gone through all that I could find, that seem'd material in the *Dialogue* between you and your Friends as to this Subject, and I assure you, I have omitted nothing which I apprehended had any Appearance of Difficulty in it. And I find not the least Reason to be unsatisfied in the Account I had given of the Difference of *Nature* and *Person*: but I still think that it doth tend very much to the right Apprehension

sion of the Doctrine of the Trinity ; as I hope doth farther appear by the foregoing Discourse.

And now to come to a Conclusion of this whole Debate. ( For I intend not to draw this Saw any longer: having done as much as I think fitting for my self to do. )

I saw no Necessity of writing again for my own Vindication as to your first Charge, which I was contented to leave to the Reader's Judgment. But in the Conclusion of my former Answer, I had said, " That as you had stated your  
 " Notion of Ideas, it may be of dangerous Consequence to that Article of  
 " the Christian Faith, which I endeavour'd to defend. This you call a new  
 Charge against your Book ; and you complain, that I do not specify the Particulars, wherein I apprehend it may be of such dangerous Consequence ; and you blame me for this saying, without shewing that it is so : and that all the Reason I give is, that it is made use of by ill Men to do mischief : that when I say, it may be, it shews only an Inclination to accuse, and proves nothing : that Danger may be apprehended where no Danger is ; that if  
 any

any thing must be laid aside, because it may be ill used, you do not know what will be innocent enough to be kept: and lastly, that the Imputation of a Tendency to Scepticism, and to the overthrowing any Article of the Christian Faith are no small Charge; and that you cannot see any Argument I have brought, that your Notion of Ideas tends to Scepticism. These things laid together, made me think it necessary to do that which I was unwilling to do, till you had driven me to it; which was to shew, the Reasons I had, why I look'd on your *Notion of Ideas*, and of *Certainty* by them, as inconsistent with it self, and with some important Articles of the Christian Faith.

170.

171.

What I have now done, I thought it my Duty to do, not with respect to my self, but to some of the Mysteries of our Faith; which I do not charge you with *opposing*, but with laying such Foundations as do tend to the Overthrow of them; of which we have had too much Experience already; and may have more, if your Way of *Certainty by Ideas* should obtain. Which I cannot think it will among such as are capable, and willing, to judge impartially. I have

M

now

( 178 )

now done with this Matter: And as some may think it the first Part of Wisdom not to begin in such Disputes (and I am of their Mind if they did not touch the Christian Faith) so they cannot but judge it the next ( as I do ) to know when to make an End.

I am,

Sir,

Your faithfull Friend,

*Sept. 22.*  
1697.

and Servant,

*Ed. Wigorn.*

F I N I S.

---

E R R A T A.

P<sup>A</sup>ge 22. line 16. after *thing*, insert *common*. P. 103  
Margin, r. p. 253. P. 115. l. 14. r. *Plotinus*. P. 130.  
l. 26. r. *this*. P. 175. l. 11. blot out *it*.



*Books written by the Right Reverend Father in  
God, Edw. L. Bishop of Worcester, and sold  
by H. Mortlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's  
Church-Yuard.*

**A** Rational account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion ; being a Vindication of the Lord Archbishop of *Canterbury's* Relation of a Conference, &c. from the pretended Answer of *T. C.* 2d. Edit. *Fol.*

*Origines Britannica*, or the Antiquities of the *British* Churches, with a Preface concerning some pretended Antiquities relating to *Britain*, in Vindication of the Bishop of *St. Asaph.* *Folio.*

*Irenicum*, A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds. *Quarto.*

*Origines Sacrae*, Or a Rational account of the Grounds of Christian Faith, as to the Truth and Divine Authority of the Script. and the matters therein contained. *4to.*

A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of *Rome*, and the hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it. *Octavo.*

An Answer to several late Treatises occasioned by a Book entituled, A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of *Rome*, and the hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it; Part I. *Octavo.*

A Second Discourse in Vindication of the Protestant Grounds of Faith, against the pretence of Infallibility in the *Roman* Church, in Answer to the Guide in Controversie, by *R. H.* Protestancy without Principles, and Reason and Religion; or the certain Rule of Faith, by *E. W.* with a particular enquiry into the Miracles of the *Roman* Church. *Octavo.*

An Answer to Mr. *Cressy's* Epistle apologetical to a Person of Honour, touching his Vindication of *Dr. Stillingfleet.* *Octavo.*

A Defence of the Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of *Rome*, in answer to a Book entituled, *Catholicks no Idolaters* : *Octavo.*

Several Conferences between a *Roman* Priest, a Fan-  
tick Chaplain, and a Divine of the Church of *England*;  
being a full Answer to the late Dialogues of *T. G.*  
*Octavo.*

A Discourse concerning Bonds of Resignation of Benefices in point of Law and Conscience, in *Octavo*.

A Discourse concerning the Illegality of the Ecclesiastical Commission, in Answer to the Vindication and Defence of it: wherein the true notion of the Legal Supremacy is cleared; and an Account is given of the Nature, Original and Mischief of the Dispensing Power.

The Unreasonableness of Separation, or an Impartial account of the History, Nature and Pleas of the present Separation from the Communion of the Church of England. *Quarto*.

The Grand Question concerning the Bishops Right to vote in Parliament in Cases Capital stated and argued, from the Parliament-Rolls and the History of former times; with an Enquiry into their Peerage, and the Three Estates in Parliament. *Octavo*.

A Discourse concerning the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction; or the true Reasons of his Sufferings; with an Answer to the *Socinian* Objections. To which is added, A Sermon concerning the Mysteries of the Christian Faith, Preached April 7. 1691. With a Preface concerning the true state of the Controversie about Christ's Satisfaction. The second Edition. *8vo*.

Twelve Sermons preached upon several Occasions Vol. I. *Octavo*.

Ten Sermons preached upon several Occasions. Vol II. *Octavo*.

A Third Volume will be shortly published.

A Discourse in Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity: with an Answer to the late *Socinian* Objections against it, from Scripture, Antiquity and Reason And a Preface concerning the different Explications of the Trinity, and the Tendency of the present *Socinian* Controversie. The second Edition. *Octavo*.

The Bishop of Worcester's Answer to Mr. Lock's Letter concerning some Passages relating to his Essay of Humane Understanding, mentioned in the late Discourse in Vindication of the Trinity. With a Postscript in Answer to some Reflections made on that Treatise in a late *Socinian* Pamphlet.

The

The Bishop of *Worcester's* Charge to the Clergy of his Diocess in his Primary Visitation begun at *Worcester*, September 11. 1690. 4s.

The Effigies of the Right Reverend Father in God, Edward Lord Bishop of *Worcester*, Engraven on a Copper-plate by *Robert White*. Price 6d.

The Rule of Faith: Or an Answer to the Treatise of Mr. J. S. entituled, *Sure-footing*, &c. by *John Tillotson*, D. D. to which is adjoyned, a Reply to Mr. J. S's third Appendix, &c. by *Edward Stillingfleet* D. D.

A Letter to Mr. G. giving a true Account of a late Conference at the D. of P's.

A Second Letter to Mr. G. in answer to two Letters lately published concerning the Conference at the D. of P's.

---

*Veteres Vindicati*: In an Expostulatory Letter to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, upon his *Consensus Veterum*, &c. wherein the absurdity of his Method, and the weakness of his Reasons are shewn; His false Aspersions upon the Church of *England* are wiped off, and her Faith concerning the Eucharist proved to be that of the Primitive Church: Together with Animadversions on Dean *Boilen's* French Translation of, and Remarks upon *Bertram*.

An Answer to the Compiler of *Nubes Testium*: Wherein is shewn, That Antiquity (in relation to the Points in Controversie set down by him) did not for the first five hundred Years Believe, Teach and Practice as the Church of *Rome* doth at present Believe, Teach and Practice; Together with a Vindication of *Veteres Vindicati* from the late weak and disingenuous Attempts of the Author of Transubstantiation Defended, by the Author of the Answer to Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*.

A Letter to Father *Lewis Sabran* Jesuit, in answer to his Letter to a Peer of the Church of *England*; wherein the Postscript to the Answer to the *Nubes Testium* is Vindicated, and Father *Sabran's* Mistakes farther discoverd.

A se.

A second Letter to Father *Lewis Sabran* Jesuit, in answer to his Reply.

A Vindication of the Principles of the Author of the Answer to the Compiler of *Nubes Testium* in answer to a late pretended Letter from a Dissenter to the Divines of the Church of *England*.

A Discourse concerning the Nature and Grounds of the Certainty of Faith, in answer to J. S. his Catholic Letters.

The Council of *Trent* Examined and Disprov'd by Catholic Tradition, in the main Points in Controversie between Us and the Church of *Rome*; with a particular Account of the Times and Occasions of Introducing them. Part. I. To which a Preface is prefixed concerning the True Sense of the Council of *Trent*, and the Notion of *Transubstantiation*.

An Historical Examination of the Authority of General Councils, shewing the False Dealing that hath been used in the publishing of them; and the Difference amongst the *Papists* themselves about their Number. The Second Edition Corrected. 4<sup>to</sup>.

The Folly and Unreasonableness of Atheism demonstrated from the Advantage and Pleasure of a Religious Life: The Faculties of Human Souls: The Structure of Animate Bodies, and the Origine and Frame of the World; in Eight Sermons: Preached at the Lecture, Founded by the Honourable *Robert Boyle*, Esq; in the first Year, 1692. By *Richard Bentley*, D. D. Chaplain in Ordinary, and Library-Keeper to His Majesty.

Of Revelation, and the Messias: A Sermon preached at the publick Commencement at *Cambridge*, July the 5th. 1696. By *Richard Bentley*, D. D. Chaplain in Ordinary, and Library-Keeper to His Majesty.

The Restoring of Fallen Brethren; containing the Substance of two Sermons on *Gal VI. 1, 2* Preached at the performance of publick Penance, by certain Criminals, on the Lord's Day, usually called *Mid-Lent-Sunday*, 1696. in the Parish Church of *Old-Swinford* in *Worcester-shire*: By *Simon Ford*, D. D. and Rector there; with a Preface, by the Right Reverend Father in God, *Edward Lord Bishop of Worcester*.

The

The New-years-gift complete, in six Parts, composed of Prayers and Meditations for every Day in the week, with Devotions for the Sacrament, Lent, and other Occasions. The first Part may be had by it self

---

*Books written by the late Reverend Anthony Horneck, D. D. Preacher at the Savoy.*

**T**HE Great Law of Consideration; or a Discourse, wherein the Nature, Usefulness, and absolute Necessity of Consideration, in order to a truly Serious, and Religious Life, is laid open, in 8<sup>vo</sup>.

The Happy Ascetick; or the Best Exercise; together with Prayers suitable to each Exercise: To which is added, a Letter to a Person of Quality, concerning the Holy Lives of the Primitive Christians, in 8<sup>vo</sup>.

Delight and Judgment Represented, in a Discourse, concerning the Great Day of Judgment; and its Power to damp and embitter Sensual Delights, Sports, and Recreations, in 8<sup>vo</sup>.

The Exercise of Prayer; or, a Help to Devotion: containing Prayers and Devotions for several Occasions.

The Antiquities of *Nottingham-shire*, Extracted out of Records, Original Evidences, Leiger-Books, and other Manuscripts, and Authentick Authorities; beautified with Maps, Prospects, and Portraitsures: By *Robert Thoreson* Dr. of Physick, Folio.

*Some*

*Some School-Books Sold by Henry Mortlok, at  
the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard.*

**H**Oratius, Interpretatione & Notis illustravit Ludovicus Des-Prez, in usum Delphini. Huic Editioni accessere vita Horatii cum Dacerii Chronologia Horatiana, & præfatio de Satyra Romana, 8vo.

L. Annæus Florus, in usum Delphini, 8vo.

Leusdeni Compendium Græcum Novi Testamenti, in 8vo. Quinta Editio.

Janua Linguarum Trilinguis, sive Johannis Amos Comenii Janua Linguarum, 8vo.

Græcæ Grammatices Rudimenta in usum Scholæ Westmonasteriensis

Busby's Apollodorus, in usum Scholæ Westmonast.

Nomenclatura Brevis Reformata, in usum Scholæ Westmonasteriensis.

An English Introduction to the Latin Tongue, for the use of the Lower Forms in *Westminster* School.

Græca Epigrammata, in usum Scholæ West.

Martialis Epigram. in usum Scholæ West.

Juvenal in usum Scholæ Westmonasteriensis.

A General Examination of the Common Greek Grammar, according to Dr. *Busby's* Method, chiefly intended for grounding young Beginners in the Greek Tongue, in the Free-School in *Newark* upon *Trent*.

A short Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, with the Church Catechism it self, and order of Confirmation in English and Latin, the Latin revised and much amended, by *Edw. Boughen*, D.D. fitted for the use of Schools.

An Explanation of the Additional Rules for the Genders of Nouns in the *Oxford* Grammar, by way of Question and Answer: by *John Twells* Master of the Free-School in *Newark*, very proper to be bound up with the *Oxford* Grammar.

With variety of other School-Books.

